



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

(119)

CR-5258-2025Date of Decision:-**06.08.2025**

PAWAN KUMAR AND ANOTHER

... Petitioners

Versus

SUBASH CHANDER AND OTHERS

... Respondents

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWALPresent:- Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The revisionist has filed this revision petition against the order dated 19.07.2025 passed by Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Fazilka, vide which an application moved by the plaintiff/respondent for examining 'handwriting expert' has been allowed.
2. The revisionist is alleging that in criminal proceedings, the disputed documents were got examined from the Director Forensic Laboratory and the Director submitted report that no definite opinion regarding common authorship or otherwise of the questioned signatures can be submitted for want of more suitable and sufficient admitted signatures of Ram Chand in Hindi, already existing on some documents, near about the period of questioned signatures. The learned counsel for the revisionist further submits that the plaintiff intentionally did not supply the signatures



so that a report unfavourable to him may not come and now he wants to examine a private handwriting expert and wants to seek a favourable report as plaintiff would be his pay-master.

3. Keeping in view the impugned order, it is clear that earlier the Civil Court has granted liberty to plaintiff to examine any other handwriting expert except Sh. Varun Gagneja and that order of learned Civil Court has not been challenged or assailed in revision petition and the proceedings in criminal case and civil suit are different proceedings. As liberty has been granted to the plaintiff to examine any other handwriting expert and the plaintiff had moved an application. Accordingly the learned Civil Judge has not committed any material illegality calling for any interference by this Court by allowing application of respondent, as such, finding no merit in the present revision petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

4. However, observations made herein above may not to be construed as opinion on the merits of the case. Same are purely confined to the present controversy and deliberations.

06.08.2025
Gaurav Sorot

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No