

1.

CC No. VK-168/04

DW2: Sh. Sayed Fazal Huda, recalled for cross examination.

On SA

XXXXXX By Sh. Atul Chaturvadi, counsel for complainant.

I have submitted my expert opinion in more than 235 cases. I can not tell the number of case in which Hon'ble Court concerned would have accepted my opinion. I have taken sample of admitted signature of complainant from vakalatnama, affidavit and her statement. In my considered opinion disputed signature marked D-1 could have been inked in year 2003. I can not determine the age of ink which was used in writing disputed signature. It is wrong to suggest that I made false statement regarding age of disputed signature in connivance with accused. I can not tell the exact number of cases in which I have given opinion regarding English signature and writing. It is correct that ball pen had been used in writing disputed signature. It is correct that the pen pressure can not be determined in case of ball pen. It is wrong to suggest that I have not explained the size, words and proportion of letters between the disputed and admitted signatures. Vol. The same is described in my report on page no. 4 and 5. I have given my opinion in my report regarding the mode of speed of writing of disputed signature which is movement and including line quality. In this case the inter-se between the letters is uniform between the admitted and disputed signatures which is of medium space. I have not given any opinion

2.

regarding the kind of pressure of pen used while writing of disputed signature. I have mentioned in my report at page no. 4 in para no. 3 regarding speed of writing which is rapid order in admitted and disputed signatures. The direction of writing of both signatures is straight and same is known as alignment. Both the sets of signatures have been written wrist cum for arm movement due to fair degree of writing speed fine edges of strokes and well define formation of the letters. There is no finger movement in between the aforesaid admitted and disputed signatures. The details of personal writing habits including loop formation, curves, joining of strokes, eyelet etc. have been mentioned in my report on page no. 5 and 6 and these characteristics found similar in both admitted and disputed signatures. It is wrong to suggest that I have filed biased opinion in this case. It is wrong to suggest that I did not mention natural variation of both types of signatures in my report. It is wrong to suggest that I have not mentioned in my report regarding more divergences in curves, loops and angle of strokes of writing. It is wrong to suggest that there is not similarity between disputed and admitted signatures. It is wrong to suggest that I am deposing falsely.

RO & AC

(Rakesh Kumar Rampuri)  
MM, NI Act, (East)/KKD  
16.10.2012