

**IN THE COURT OF IV ADDITIONAL CHIEF METROPOLITAN
MAGISTRATE, BANGALORE.**

CC No.15171/2012

CW :10 PW: 4

Name : Prof.K.Ramakrishnan

Father's name : Late R Krishnamurthy

Age : 76 Years

Occupation : Retired Assistant Director of Documentation division. FSL, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Residence : Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Duly sworn on : 23.3.2021.

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY SR. APP:

1. I retired from my service on 31.10.2003. Now I am working in Truth Lab which is an independent Forensic Science Laboratory from 2010 as a Director of Documentation division.
2. I have been trained in the field of forensic document examination for 2 years at the forensic science department during the period 1968 to 1970. I had examined thousands of cases in Civil, Criminal, Regulatory and non litigation matters. I also examined lakhs and lakhs documents and given scientific reports to the various courts and agencies. I had also given evidence in various courts in Tamil Nadu as well as other States in my official capacity. I was also faculty of University of Madras to teach students of M.Sc in Forensic Science, M.A. in Criminology and Forensic Science. I was designated as Professor in this field. I had also given guest lecturer at various Judicial academy, bar association.

3. On 19.9.2011 a requisition was received from the inspector of police, Gangamanagudi police station dated 9.9.2011 at Truth Lab Bangalore Office. As per the instruction of our Chairman this case is received at Truth Lab, Bangalore and transferred to Truth Lab, Chennai office where it was received on 22.9.2011.
4. This case was initially allotted by our chairman to one Mr.Srihari . He fell sick and it transferred to me for examination.
5. I received the questioned documents which are as follows.
 - a.) Original unregistered notarized General Power of Attorney dated 17.3.2004 in which there are disputed signatures of three persons by name Ratnamma, Subbaiah and S.Srinivasalu on various pages. For which I assigned the markings as Q1 to Q3, Q4 to Q6 and Q7 to Q9 respectively.
 - b.) Original notarized affidavit dated 11.3.2004 bearing disputed signatures of above 3 persons for which I have assigned the markings as Q10 and Q11 one person, Q12 and Q13 another person and last person Q14 and Q15 respectively.
6. I received these two disputed documents.
7. I have received following standard documents
 - a.) 11 sheets of papers in which specimen signature of Ratnamma obtained by the investigating officer on 2 dates namely 17.8.2011 and 26.12.2009 for which I assigned the markings as S1 to S25 respectively.
 - b.) 11 sheets of papers in which specimen signature of Subbaiah obtained by the investigating officer on 2 dates namely 17.8.2011 and 26.12.2009 for which I assigned the markings as S26 to S51 respectively.
 - c.) 11 sheets of papers in which specimen signature of S.Srinivasalu obtained by the investigating officer on 2 dates namely 17.8.2011 and 26.12.2009 for which I assigned the markings as S52 to S76 respectively.

8. I also received one more additional standard documents namely
- a.) Photocopy of notarized lease agreement dated.19.1.2004 in which the admittedly genuine signatures of above 3 persons namely Ratnamma, S.Srinivasalu and Subbaiah for which I assigned the markings as S77 and S78 for one person, S79 and S80 for another person and for third person S81 respectively. This document was sent by the Inspector of police, Gangammanagudi PS along with his requisition letter dated 23.2.2012 and it was directly received at Truth Lab, Chennai Office on 29.2.2012.
9. I carefully examined and compared the questioned signatures of each person with their respective standard signature and I had offered the following 3 opinion.
- a.) The person who signed the standard signatures marked as S1 to S25, S77 and S78 did not sign the disputed signatures marked as Q1 to Q3, Q10 and Q11. They differs significantly in the handwriting characteristics on interse comparison which I have given in my opinion. This opinion relates to the individual named Ratnamma.
 - b.) The person who signed the standard signatures marked as S26 to S51, S81 did not sign the questioned signatures marked as Q4 to Q6, Q12 and Q13. They differs significantly in the handwriting characteristics on interse comparison which I have shown in my opinion. This opinion relates to the individual named Subbaiah.
 - c.) The person who signed the standard signatures marked as S52 to S76, S79 and S80 did not sign the questioned signatures marked as Q7 to Q9, Q14 and Q15. They differs significantly in the handwriting characteristics on interse comparison which I have mentioned in my opinion. This opinion relates to the person called S.Srinivasalu.

10. I have given report dated 15.3.2012 and all the documents along with the report sent back to Inspector of police, Gangammanagudi PS, Bangalore. Along with my reports I had furnished comparison chart of signatures of all the 3 persons.
11. Now I am seeing the power of attorney and affidavit which are disputed and questioned documents. In which the seal of our lab is found and I have given the questioned signatures with blue pencil which is inside the red circled portion of the signature. The witness identified the documents which he had received for examination and already General power of attorney is marked as Ex.P.4 and the affidavit is already marked as Ex.P.5.
12. Now I am seeing 6 sheets specimen signature of Ratnamma which are of dated 17.8.2011. I assigned to these signatures of Ratnamma as S1 to S11 with blue pencil. The witness identified the standard signature of Ratnamma which had taken by the IO on 17.8.2011 and they all together marked as Ex.P.23. Now I am seeing the 5 sheets specimen signatures of Ratnamma which are dated 26.12.2009 and I have given the S12 to S25 with blue pencil. The said standard signature of Ratnamma which obtained by the IO on 26.12.2009 is already marked as Ex.P.8 to 12.
13. Now I am seeing 6 sheets specimen signatures of Subbaiah which are of dated 17.8.2011. I assigned to these signatures of Subbaiah as S26 to S36 with blue pencil. The witness identified the standard signature of Subbaiah which had taken by the IO on 17.8.2011 and they all together marked as Ex.P.24. Now I am seeing the 5 sheets specimen signatures of Subbaiah which are dated 26.12.2009 and I have given the S37 to S51 with blue pencil. The said standard signature of Subbaiah which obtained by the IO on 26.12.2009 is already marked as Ex.P.13 to 17.
14. Now I am seeing 6 sheets of specimen signatures of S.Srinivasalu which are of dated 17.8.2011. I assigned to these signatures of S.Srinivasalu as S52 to S62 with blue pencil. The witness

identified the standard signature of S.Srinivasalu which had taken by the IO on 17.8.2011 and they all together marked as Ex.P.25. Now I am seeing the 5 sheets of specimen signatures of S.Srinivasalu which are dated 26.12.2009 and I have given the S63 to S76 with blue pencil. The said standard signature of S.Srinivasalu which obtained by the IO on 26.12.2009 is already marked as Ex.P.18 to 22.

15. Now I am seeing the another standard document of lease agreement which is sent by the IO. The said document is a photocopy of lease agreement. I assigned the signatures with S77, S78, S79, S80 and S81 with blue pencil. The witness identified the standard document that is photocopy of lease deed and it is marked as Ex.P.26.
16. Now I am the signature comparison chart of Ratnamma, Subbaiah and S.Srinivasalu which are in total 8 sheets. Witness identified the signature comparison chart of Ratnamma which is in 3 sheets and together it marked as Ex.P.27. Witness identified the signature comparison chart of Subbaiah which is in 2 sheets and together it marked as Ex.P.28. Witness identified the signature comparison chart of S.Srinivasalu which is in 3 sheets and together it marked as Ex.P.29.
17. Now I am seeing forwarding letter to the Inspector of police, Gangammanagudi PS dated 15.3.2012 and along with said letter I forwarded the documents which I have received along with my report and I signed to the said letter and this is my signature. The witness identified the forwarding letter dated 15.3.2012 and it marked as Ex.P.30 and the signature of witness is marked as Ex.P.30(a). Now I am seeing the annexure and my signature in it. The said annexure is marked as Ex.P.31 and signature Ex.P.31(a). Now I am seeing my opinion report dated 15.3.2012 and I have signed to the said report and this is my signature. Witness identified his report dated 15.3.2012 and it marked as Ex.P.32

and witness identified his signature on each page and his signature at last page is marked as Ex.P.32(a).

Cross examination: Sri.BSG advocate for accused No.1 to 3 prays time for cross examination. Time granted only on cost of Rs.4500/- payable to witness.

(Typed to my dictation in the open Court)

ROI & AC

IV ACMM

