

IN THE COURT OF PRL CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC HOSAPETE

CC No.2607/2019

CW -1

Name of the witness : Apoorva C.G.
Father's name : Gangadharayya
Age : 25 years
Occupation : Senior Scientific Officer
Residence : Bengaluru

The witness appears through Video conferencing using jit.si/PCJHOS link provided by the Court at 01.00 p.m.

Duly sworn on: 22-10-2024

Examination in chief

I have worked as trainee Scientific Officer, Scientific Officer in Truth Labs, till January -2024. I have been working as Senior Scientific Officer since January -2024.

In this case, along with the commissioner warrant we have received memo of instructions filed by the complainant and the accused.

The warrant was also accompanied by original cheque pertaining to bank account maintained at Indian Bank, Hosapete Branch, Ballari, Vakalathnama, Original unregistered sale agreement and specimen signatures of the accused.

After receiving the warrant and the above said documents, we have registered the present case in file No. TLB/QD/190/2023. The case was primarily allotted to the expert Sri. Shankrappa Mural, Director, Documents Division, Truth Lab. In order to assist him, the file was secondarily allotted to me, as I was working as Scientific Officer during that period to draft the opinion.

At the time of examination of the documents, the question documents are generally marked in **Q** series and the admitted signatures are marked in **S** series. After marking the documents, the same are scanned in high resolution. We examine the scanned signatures in video spectral comparator (VSC) and study the same under different wavelength. We prepare Juxtapose chart during the examination. After preparation of the said chart, we draft the opinion. After drafting the opinion the same is sent to the chairman for approval.

In this case we have followed the above procedure. The following opinions are given by us:

Opinion No. 1. The person who wrought the standard signatures marked as S1 to S 21 also wrote the questioned signatures marked as Q 1 and Q 2.

Opinion No. 2. The questioned date portion marked as Q3 is altered from the pre-existing figure |1|5|0|7|2|0|1|3| to |1|5|0|7|2|0|1|8| by altering the numeral '3'.

We have given detailed reasoning for arriving at such opinions in the report. Now, I see the report submitted by I and Shankrappa Mural to the Court. The report consisting of 6 pages is marked as **Ex.C. 1.**

Cross examination by : Sri. SRS., Counsel for the complainant

I am aware of the facts of the case. The report at Ex.C. 1 was prepared by Shankrappa Mural with my technical assistance. It is false to suggest that it requires minimum 20 years of experience to prepare such a report. I do not know how many years of experience one must have to hold the post held by Sri. Shankrappa Mural. It is false to suggest that as on the date of report I was not authorized to prepare such a report. It is true to suggest that Shankrappa Mural was having experience of 28 years when he joined Truth Lab. It is true to suggest that the reasoning for forming opinion No. 1 run about 3 pages and reasoning for opinion No. 2 is only of 2 lines. It is false to suggest that the examination is not done properly and the reasonings given are not proper.

It is true to suggest that after completion of my education this is my first job at Truth Lab. Shankrappa Mural was suffering from life threatening diseases for about 3 years. The witness volunteers to state that he was on dialysis for 3 years. It is false to suggest that shankrappa mural was suffering from other diseases. It is true to suggest that shankrappa Mural was 71 years old when the report was prepared. During the above said 3 years shankrappa mural regularly attend the office. There is digital attendance to show the same, which is in power of our director. Shankrappa Mural was attending the work physically as well as virtually depending on the work load and health condition. The original memo of Instructions given by the accused and the complainant are in our office. It is false to suggest that the memo of instructions are Court documents and therefore they can not be kept in our office.

It is false to suggest that when the numerals are examined using different wavelength and in different angles, the impressions are different. It is true to suggest that the alleged alteration in the numeral is not visible to the naked eye. It is true to suggest that the electronic instruments are used for preparing the report and arriving at the opinion given by us. It is false to suggest that the certificate has to be issued in accordance with law whenever electronic instrument is used.

The death of shnkrappa mural was informed to the Court and the counsel for accused by the incharge director. The Commissioner Fee was paid through UPI transaction using phonepe. The receptionist of Truth Labs, might have given the phonepe mobile number to the counsel for accused. It is false to suggest that the counsel for accused has been in regular contract with Truth labs since the said transaction.

The ink used for alleged alteration is different from the ink used for writing the earlier numeral. The said fact is mentioned in the report. It is mentioned in page No. 6, point No. 2 in second line. Tint of ink means the inks are of different shades. The age of the ink is not examined. The witness volunteers to state that the age of the ink can not be determined. We have not examined whether the alleged alteration and the original writings are of the same person or not. It is true to suggest that there is facility to compare hand writings in our lab. The witness volunteers to state that to compare hand writings the minimum amount of strokes are to be required and in case of alteration there will be single stroke which can not be compared.

It is false to suggest that shankrappa mural was unable to prepare the report due to his ill health as on the date mentioned in the report. It is false to suggest that I was also not experienced to give such report.

Shankrappa Mural was the only person holding the post of director in Truth Labs, Bengaluru. It is false to suggest that I have given a biased report in order to help the accused in the present case. It is false to suggest that I am deposing falsely in order to help the accused.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court, corrected and then signed by me, since the witness appeared through video conferencing, her signature is not taken on the deposition.)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Hosapete.