

E - 235/09/07

RW-2

Sh.Syed Faizal Huda S/o Sh.S. A. Huda, Forensic Expert, R/o H-42, Abul Fazal Enclave, Jamia Nagar, Okhla New Delhi.

On S. A.

I am a forensic expert. My qualification is B.Sc.(Hon) Forensic Science along with the practical training on the subject of Forensic Science. I have given reports in more than 250 cases in various courts of Delhi as well as NCR.

In this case, I have taken the photographs of disputed and admitted signatures (marking mentioned in my report) on dated 20.11.2012 and my definite opinion is these signatures are written and signed by the same person. My report is Ex.RW-2/A, bearing my signatures at point A which is collectively running into nine pages along with CD.

XXX by Sh.B. K. Jha Adv. Ld. Counsel for petitioner.

I am in this profession since 2009. There is no need for enrollment with any council in this profession. It is wrong to suggest that it is required to enroll with the council. In the case of 2G Spectrum the company of Reliance had engaged me to verify the signatures of certain documents. I have used magnifying lense, computer software adobe photoshop 7.0 to verify the admitted and disputed signatures. It is not necessary to use flash magnifier in modern forensic technique. It is incorrect to suggest that the flash magnifier is necessary to use for comparing the admitted signatures and disputed signatures. It is correct that I have not used illuminated

microscope instrument in the comparison of admitted and disputed signatures. Vol. these instruments are used for the examination of original documents, not the photographs. It is correct that I had taken the photographs of original documents. It is correct that in the disputed signatures only “Bhupesh” word is mentioned. It is correct that in the admitted signatures “Bhupesh Gupta” is mentioned. It is incorrect to suggest that “Bhupesh” word mentioned in disputed signatures is larger than the admitted signatures. It is correct that in the comparison the pressure, skill, variation of the writer is also seen. Vol. Pen pressure, shading are examined only in ink pen only and not in ball point pen case. It is correct that I have not mentioned this fact in my report that it is used only in ink pen and not in ball pen.

It is incorrect that the admitted signatures is written in medium size, straight slant with heavy pressure and differ from the disputed signatures. The variation of the time in signatures may vary from person to person but not in this case as there is a perfect line quality and rapidity of motion of the signatures. In admitted signatures there is high skill in writing. It is incorrect to suggest that in admitted signatures there is low skill in writing. It is incorrect to suggest that the placement of body stroke of letter “B” is different from admitted signatures and disputed signatures. It is correct that I have not compared letter “e”. vol. because it was not clearly mentioned in D-1 signatures and all admitted signatures. It is incorrect to suggest that it is clearly mentioned in admitted signatures. It is incorrect that the base of letter “h” is different in both sets of signatures. It is incorrect that the letter ‘s’ is

also different from each other. I do not remember that I have given any report against the party who has engaged me to file the report. It is incorrect to suggest that I have given the report in favour of the respondent as he has engaged me to give the report. I have taken three to four hours time to prepare this report. It is incorrect that more time is required in preparing the report. It is incorrect to suggest that I have not examined the signatures properly or I have given a false report. The photographs have been taken by digital camera therefore no negative is filed with my report but the CD is on record. It is correct that I have not mentioned in my report that the photographs have been taken with digital camera. Vol. as it is not necessary. It is incorrect to suggest that it is so necessary.

**RO & AC**

**(Munish Markan)**

**ARC(South)/10.01.2013**