

CR-6483-2019 (O&M)

2025:PHHC:075533



118 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-6483-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : 22.05.2025

Smt. Krishana Devi & anr.

....Petitioners

Versus

Dharampal Yadav (deceased) thr his LRs & ors.

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present:- Mr. P.R.Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gulshan Nandwani, Advocate
for respondent No.2

PANKAJ JAIN, J.(ORAL)

1 Challenge is to the order dated 17.08.2019 (Annexure P-6) whereby application filed by plaintiffs to get the signatures of Dharampal Yadav-Defendant No.1 on the document Ex.PW3/A compared from a Government agency has been declined.

2 Plaintiffs filed present suit claiming partition of the suit property by common ancestor of the parties vide settlement deed dated 09.11.1997. The settlement deed is Ex.PW3/A. Defendants have denied the same. Both the parties examined hand writing experts to prove their respective stand. The plaintiffs thereafter moved present application praying



that the document be got examined from a Government agency like FSL Madhuban. The said application has been dismissed vide impugned order.

3 Learned counsel for the plaintiffs has assailed the impugned order claiming that in case of two contradictory reports of Handwriting experts on file, it is imperative that the document be referred to a neutral agency.

4 Reliance is being placed upon judgments passed in *Chamkaur Singh Vs. Mithu Singh, 2014(1) RCR (Civil) 303, Inderjit Kaur Vs. Sh.Kuljeet Singh Shan & ors. passed in CR No.6555 of 2015 decided on 02.05.2018, Vijay Taneja Vs. Naresh Gureja, 2024 (2) RCR (Criminal) 442, Parveen Kumar Vs. Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh & ors., passed in CWP No.12264 of 2016 decided on 08.11.2016, K.R.Selvam Vs. Pappa @ Radha & ors, 2023(2) MadWN(Civil) 509 and Enagandula Venkateswarlu Vs. Erra Ram Shankar, 2023(3) Law Summary 11.*

5 Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that no interference is required in the impugned order. Trite it is that science of comparison of handwriting is not perfect science. The opinion rendered by handwriting expert cannot be held to be conclusive. As per settled law the report of the handwriting expert is only a corroborative piece of evidence which has to be read in aid of other cogent substantive evidence. Parties have already examined handwriting experts. Court is yet to apply its mind. There is no law that mandates for calling of report from Government agency in case of conflicting opinions given by handwriting experts examined by the parties.

CR-6483-2019 (O&M)

2025-PHHC-075533



6 Finding no merits in the present revision petition, the same is ordered to be dismissed.

22.05.2025

Pooja Sharma-I

**(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No