

1.

CC no. VK-2415/07

CW3: Sh. Sayed Faisal Huda (BS c Forensic Science and MSC Forensic Science), S/o Sh. Sayed Ainul Huda, R/o H-42, Abul Failal Enclave, Jamiya Nagar, Okhla, New Delhi, handwriting expert.

On SA

I filed my report which is Ex. CW3/A containing 7 pages. I also filed photographs Ex. CW3/B (colly) and CD of negative Ex. CW3/C. I am of considered opinion that the signature at point D1 has not been written by the same person who had written the admitted signatures marked as A1 to A8.

XXXXXX By Sh. V. K. Sharma, counsel for accused.

It is incorrect that I have not received any studies in the science of handwriting identification from any recognized institution. It is further incorrect that I have not received any practical expertise in aforesaid branch of study. I have two years experience in this field. I measure the speed of handwriting from the nature of the strokes. Line quality is tested by nature of the strokes and movement employed by the writer, if the writing speed is fast movement is wrist comes fore arm. Hence we can say that the movement is directly proportionate to writing speed. If line quality is defective the movement is finger. It is incorrect to suggest that I have not taken photograph from judicial file. It is further incorrect to suggest that I have not examined and compare any admitted signature from disputed signature. As the basis of my individual and

2.

class corrector I am of the opinion that the D1 signature has not been written by the written of the admitted signature. I have compared A1 to A8 signatures with the disputed signature marked as D1. It is incorrect to suggest that the signatures at point D1 has been executed by the same person who has signed at point A1 to A8. It is incorrect to suggest that I have not given any detail regarding speed, curves, angles, rhythm, line quality, spacing, sizing anywhere in my report. I have shown aforesaid details on page no. 4 in my report Ex. CW3/A. I have mentioned movement with respect of the disputed and the admitted signatures in my report on page no. 4. It is incorrect to suggest that I have not marked or shown any point of forgery on the photo-enlargemnet with respect to the disputed and admitted signatures anywhere my report. I have not major any pen operation in my report. It is incorrect to suggest that my report Ex. CW3/A is general in nature an not supported with scientific analysis. It is wrong to suggest that I filed the wrong and forge report on behalf of complainant. It is wrong to suggest that I am not handwriting expert.

RO & AC

(Rakesh Kumar Rampuri)

MM, NI Act, (East)/KKD

12.08.2011