

**IN THE COURT OF SH. VINOD KUMAR
SPL. JUDGE: CBI-II : ROHINI: DELHI
CBI VS. K.M. Singh etc. (Nirankari Colony Post Office)
CC NO. 01/10
Dated: 05.05.2012**

**DW-1(Produced by accused Sunil Kumar A-6) Sh. Syed Faizal Huda(recalled for cross examination in continuation to dt. 20.04.2012)
On SA**

XXX By Sh. Amrit Pal Singh, Ld. PP for CBI.

I have already mentioned in my statement as well as in my report regarding my academic qualification. I have completed my Bachelor Degree in Forensic Science in the year 2006-2009 and M.Sc. Forensic Science in the year 2009-2011.

Q Please tell about your training period?

A Training is included in my academic qualification. No other training is required.

Q When did you start your professional career, please specify the date?

A I have started my professional career after completion of my Bachelor Degree in the year 2009.

Q Where is your office/laboratory?

A My office/laboratory is situated at my residence as well as Karkardooma Court Chamber.

Q When it was established?

A When I have started my professional career, as said above.

The laboratory is independently owned by me. For the purpose of comparison of handwriting, I have used the computer software

techniques, adobe photoshop, CS-1 to CS-III for the purpose of enlargement of photographs to arrive at a definite opinion. (Voltd. For the purpose of handwriting comparison instrumental forensic instruments such as VSC Docu Center, TLC are not required because they can be used only in the case of ink analysis not for handwriting comparison.)

I have been engaged in this case in first week of February, 2012 by accused Sunil Kumar. I cannot tell as to how many charges I had received from Sunil Kumar because this is a professional secret.

Q Please tell as to on which date you had received the documents in the present case for examination?

A I do not remember exact date. The certified copy of the documents were given by Mr. Sunil Kumar to me near about second week of February, 2012.

Q How much time you as well as your brother took in examining of the documents in the present case?

A I and my brother have taken near about two months to examine the documents.

The time period we have taken is sufficient to analyze and examine the documents. It was completed about three four days prior to submission of the report in this Hon'ble Court.

Q Did you and your brother prepare the examination sheet while examining the documents?

A We have not prepared such type of examination sheets but prepared the rough notes of opinion before typing on the computer.

I do not remember as to from which date I had calculated 200 cases

in which I had given my opinion. I had testified before the courts of law in more than 35 cases.

Q Please specify in how many cases wherein you had testified as an expert, the court had relied upon your opinion?

A I cannot tell.

It is wrong to suggest that court did not rely my opinion, that's why I am not disclosing the numbers. (Voltd. I appeared as witness sometime at initial case, sometime in middle of the case. The judgments are never pronounced in my presence, but, I heard that my opinion was relied upon.) However, I cannot give details of those cases at present.

Q Please tell whether Amity University from which you had obtained degree of Forensic Science is called as a qualified University in India with regard to questioned documents including handwriting?

A Yes.

It is incorrect to suggest that Amity University is not a qualified University for the aforesaid purpose. It is correct that the Government Examiners used to come for delivering lectures during the course of training.

Q Please tell about the types of specimen signatures?

A Specimen signatures are generally of two types: (1) Requested Specimen Signatures and (2) Admitted specimen signatures. Requested specimen signatures are those which are collectively taken by someone in the presence of court and the second one is appearing on the records documents such as affidavits or officials records, general power of attorney etc.

It is correct that we had taken the help of requested specimen

signatures available on judicial file. It is also correct that we had enlarged the photographs of disputed/specimen signatures from the certified copies made available by Sunil Kumar.

It is correct that a photograph of any letter can be enlarged to a certain extent and after that it may lose its originality. (Voltd. If a photograph is enlarged up to a great extent, then, the strokes of the letters may be blurred.) It is incorrect that a photograph of a photocopy of a particular document is taken could be different from the original. Ink analysis cannot be possible in photocopy matter, but, possible in original documents. (Voltd. For handwriting comparison of admitted or specimen and disputed documents, ink analysis is not necessary.)

It is correct that the measurement of a particular letter cannot be possible, but, it can be determined by the relative size and proportion of other comparative letters on the enlarged photographs.

It is correct that the enlarged photographs of specimen signatures of Sunil Kumar placed on judicial record along with my report are taken of only first three lines. It is incorrect to suggest that I did not examine the remaining four lines of specimen signatures for the purpose of my opinion. (Voltd. For easy demonstration and understanding, I have randomly taken upper three lines of each page of specimen signature sheets for the purpose of enlargement of photographs.) It is correct that enlarged photographs of remaining four lines of all specimen signatures is not placed on record. (Voltd. It is not required because enlargement of the entire page cannot be possible on the A-4 size paper.)

It is correct that I had placed on record the enlarged photographs of only 32 disputed signatures. It is incorrect to suggest that I deliberately

omitted to make enlarge photographs of other disputed signatures and it is also incorrect to suggest that I did not examine those disputed signatures. (Voltd. It was done only to avoid making voluminous large number of photographs to be placed on judicial file.) It is wrong to suggest that the questioned document no. 8089, 8099 & specimen signature S-646 appearing at **point X & point X-1** encircled in red are matching each other. It is wrong to suggest that the questioned document no. 8094 & specimen signature S-646 appearing at **point X-2** encircled in red are matching each other. It is wrong to suggest that the questioned document no. 8044 & specimen signature S-646 appearing at **point X-3** encircled in red are matching each other. It is wrong to suggest that the questioned document no. 8054 & specimen signature S-646 appearing at **point X-4** encircled in red are matching each other. It is wrong to suggest that the questioned document no. 8059 & 8064 & specimen signature S-646 appearing at **point X-5** encircled in red are matching each other. (Voltd. These similarities are only superficial and do not fall under the range of natural variation because written by the two different writers.)

Q I put it to you that enlargement of photographs is not only the sole method of forensic science to arrive at a conclusion in the examination of documents. Is it correct?

A It is incorrect. (Voltd. Enlarged photographs is the best method to give handwriting opinion written by the same or different persons. In this case, I have prepared the enlarged photographs for this purpose to arrive at a definite opinion. Other instrumental techniques stated above in the statement were also adopted for examination.)

The enlargement of the photographs of the specimen and questioned handwriting is the only method for giving opinion about the writers of the same, by applying the scientific principles of handwriting and parameters (Class as well as Individual). It is incorrect to suggest that enlargement of the photographs, as stated above is the only method of giving opinion as to the writer of the same. It is correct that apart from the enlargement of photographs of the handwriting, there are 15 or more other methods for giving the opinion on the handwriting. (Voltd. Enlargement of the photograph is the best method among all these methods and the other methods are not used for handwriting comparison about writer. They are useful in the cases of alteration of documents {including addition, erasers, obliterations etc.})

It ^{is} incorrect to suggest that the writer of the questioned as well as the specimen signatures is one and the same person. It is incorrect to suggest that I have given this opinion with a view to save accused Sunil Kumar.

RO & AC

**(VINOD KUMAR)
SPL. JUDGE, CBI-II,
ROHINI, DELHI:05.05.2012**