



A.No.1476 of 2025 in
C.S.No.97 of 2013

WEB COPY **C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.**

This application has been filed by the defendants in the suit seeking a direction to again compare the admitted signature of the first defendant Dr.M.Thirupathi Reddy with the signatures as found in the other documents marked by P.W.1 during the course of his examination. As a matter of fact, an application has been earlier filed in A.No.930 of 2024 seeking an exercise to be conducted by the Forensic Department for comparing the signatures of Dr.M.Thirupathi Reddy with the admitted signatures.

2. It is contended by the learned counsel of the applicants that the applicants specifically admit the signature in the first page of Ex.P1 which is the agreement of sale and denies every other signature said to be made by the first applicant in all other documents marked by the plaintiff. Therefore, to compare the admitted signature with the disputed signatures, an earlier application was filed to forward the original documents to the Forensic Department to give a report after comparing the signatures. A report had also been received.

3. The grievance raised by the learned counsel for the applicants is that the examiner had taken the questioned signatures as all the three signatures in each of the three pages in the agreement of sale / Ex.P1 and compared the same with the other signatures in the other Exhibits forwarded

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.



WEB COPY

gsk

for comparison, instead of retaining the signature in the first page as an admitted signature and comparing it with the questioned signatures viz., signatures in the second and third pages of Ex.P1 and the signatures in the other documents which had been forwarded.

4. A strong objection is raised on behalf of the respondent / plaintiff that the report which had been forwarded is explanatory in nature and the second exercise need not be done. Let me keep that issue open. More clarity will be available, if the examiner who actually compared the signature is invited to graze the witness box and a question can be put to him as to the method he followed and the signature he compared and which signature he retained as the admitted signature and which signature he retained as the dispute/questioned signature. On appreciation of the evidence tendered by such examiner, if necessity is still there, the applicants may file a further application. But let not the trial process be delayed owing to this aspect.

5. Hence, this application stand closed giving that particular liberty to the applicants to once again analyse the evidence of the examiner and then to take a further decision about the necessity to compare signature of the first applicant.

24.06.2025

gsk

A.No.1476 of 2025 in
C.S.No.97 of 2013