

**IN THE COURT OF SH. VINOD KUMAR
SPL. JUDGE: CBI-II : ROHINI: DELHI**

CBI VS. K.M. Singh etc.

CC NO. 19/09

Dated: 05.05.2012

DW-1 (pertaining to accused Satish Pal Singh & Laxman Prasad)

**Sh. Syed Faizal Huda Aged: 26 years, S/o S.A. Huda, R/o H-42,
Abul Fazal Enclave, Jamia Nagar, Okhla, Delhi.**

On SA

I and my brother Mr. Syed Faisal Huda both are Forensic Experts and working in this field for the last 2 ½ years in Delhi NCR & various states of India. Our academic qualification is B.Sc. (Hons.) Forensic Science from Amity University, U.P. and M.Sc. Forensic Science alongwith the practical training on the subject of Forensic Science. We have already submitted opinion in more than 200 cases in various Hon'ble Courts on the subject of handwriting identification and also appeared as an expert witness in various courts of law.

In this case, we have been engaged by Mr. Satish Pal Singh present in court to examine and verifying the disputed/questioned signatures appearing on the KVPs(which are total 16 in number) and compared them with the comparative specimen signatures (total 22 sheets). After obtaining permission from the Hon'ble Court, I and my brother have taken the photographs from the judicial file of this case on 28.04.2012. We have scientifically carefully examined and compared. The details of disputed writings and signatures as well as specimen writings and signatures have been mentioned in my report on page no. 2 submitted before the Hon'ble Court and my report is marked as **Ext.DW1/A** (Collectively) from page 1 to 8 and CD attached therewith is at **point A-1**.

My signatures is at **point A** and that of my brother's at **point B**. The enlarged photographs is also exhibited as **Ext.DW1/B (Colly)** from page 1 to 17. In this photograph at **point A** is the image of specimen writing/signature and at **point B** is the image of questioned writing/signatures on each pages and my signatures and that of my brother's signatures alongwith rubber stamp are at **points A-1** and **points B-1** on each page.

In this case, we have been engaged by Sh. Laxman Prasad Thakur present in court to examine and verifying the disputed/questioned signatures appearing on the KVPs(which are total 26 in number) and compared them with the comparative specimen signatures (total 22 sheets). After obtaining permission from the Hon'ble Court, I and my brother have taken the photographs from the judicial file of this case on 28.04.2012. We have scientifically carefully examined and compared. The details of disputed writings and signatures as well as specimen writings and signatures have been mentioned in my report on page no. 2 submitted before the Hon'ble Court and my report is marked as **Ext.DW1/C** (Collectively) from page 1 to 11 and CD attached therewith is at **point A-2**. My signatures is at **point A** and that of my brother's at **point B**. The enlarged photographs is also exhibited as **Ext.DW1/D (Colly)** from page 1 to 24. In this photograph at **point A** is the image of specimen writing/signature and at **point B** is the image of questioned writing/signatures on each pages and my signatures and that of my brother's signatures alongwith rubber stamp are at **points A-1** and **points B-1** on each page.

During examination of the aforesaid documents, we have prepared the enlarged photographs of the aforesaid disputed and admitted signatures/writings to arrive at definite opinion. We have applied scientific principles of handwriting and certain characteristic features including class as well as individual already mentioned in my report. For the preparation of enlargement, we have used the latest computer techniques by softwares such as adobe photoshop 7.0 version to CS-I to CS-V to verify each and minute details of the signatures/writings. After careful examination and comparison, we are of the definite opinion that the disputed signatures/writings have not been written by the writer of the specimen signatures/writings but written by two different writers. These were examined by me and my brother individually and jointly and the detailed reasons starting from page no. 3 to 6 (**Ext.DW1/A**) & from page no. 3 to 9 (**Ext.DW1/C**) which have been elaborately mentioned in my both reports.

XXX By Sh. Amrit Pal Singh, Ld. Public Prosecutor 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 on 28.04.2012 by accused Laxman Prasad and Satish Pal Singh. I cannot tell as to how many charges I had received from Laxman Prasad and Satish Pal Singh because this is a professional secret.

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 one week to examine the documents.

The time period we have taken is sufficient to analyze and examine the documents. It was completed about within a week.

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 court record after obtaining permission from the Hon'ble Court.

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 upto a great extent, then, the strokes of the letters may be blurred.) It is incorrect that a photograph of 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 Satish Pal Singh and Laxman Prasad Thakur placed on judicial record alongwith my report are taken of only first four lines. It is incorrect to suggest that I did not examine the remaining three lines of specimen signatures for the purpose of my opinion. (Voltd. For easy demonstration and understanding, I have randomly taken upper four lines of each page of specimen signature sheets for the purpose of enlargement of photographs.) It is correct that enlarged photographs of remaining three 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.)

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.})

(Further cross examination is deferred at the request of Ld. PP as it is already 2.52 p.m.)

**SPL. JUDGE, CBI-II,
ROHINI,DELHI:05.05.2012**