

Deposition of Witness No.10 for the prosecution.

I do hereby on solemn affirmation state that :

My name is : Prabhakar Umakant Malwadkar,

Age : 52 years, Occ. : Finger Print Expert, Special I.G.P.

Office, Nanded Range, Latur Road, Nanded.

Examination-in-chief : by Shri. V.V. Deshpande, A.P.P. for the State.

1. In year 2022, I was working as Finger Print Expert, at S.P. Office, Latur. We received a phone-call of police informing us to visit at the incidental spot. Accordingly, our entire team with the required implements visited the incidental house at Katpur Road. After conducting observation of the entire incidental spot, we searched the domestic articles for obtaining chance prints. We found four finger prints on wooden cupboard in the said house after applying developing powder. The team photographer snapped photographs of the said finger prints. We also found the finger prints on two mobile phones of Apple and One Plus make respectively.

2. After arresting the accused, the police sent a letter at page No.18 now read over to me for verification of the finger print. It bears our acknowledgment, its content is true and correct and it is at **Ext.253**. After verifying those finger prints, I found it matches with the finger print of one of the accused persons enlisted in the said letter. It was sent for verification to Nanded Range Office. The concerned P.I. sent opinion to Deputy

Director, Finger Print Bureau. The final opinion was sent to us. Mr. A.S. Bhise was our Deputy Director at that time. The original opinion I have brought today with me. Now, the opinion at page No.19 shown to me bears his signature and its content is true and correct and it is at **Ext.254**. The report reveals the incriminating finger print was of accused Balu @ Balusing Amarsing Tak. The spot inspection report at page No.17 now shown to me was prepared by me with my signature, its content is true and correct and it is at **Ext.255**.

Cross-examination : by Shri. J.P. Chitade, Adv. for A. Nos.2 & 8.

3. Range PI was my then superior officer. I did not inform him in writing about the said phone-call. There was no necessity to take permission of superior officer to attend the call.

4. I did not take any course or diploma in the finger print field. I have been working in the same capacity since year 2012. I am a government servant. I enquired about the probable access of the thieves in the house. The final opinion was given on 09.11.2022. Those photographs were snapped in office camera. It is correct that those photographs were not handed over to the police. It is incorrect that I do not know manner in which those photographs were snapped. It is correct that the police did not take the photographs of the finger prints of the accused persons for verification in my presence. I did not enquire about whether the concerned police officer obtained prior permission for the same. Those finger prints were taken in roll and plain form.

5. Those finger prints were verified manually. It is correct that there is difference in between manual and machine verification. It is correct that the discrepancies could occur in manual examination. It is correct that the incriminating finger prints and verifying finger prints were not handed over to the police. It is correct that I gave the said opinion as per my knowledge. It is incorrect that there would be similarity in the finger prints of many persons.

6. It is correct that the report at Ext.254 does not reveal the number of photographs of both of the finger prints used for verification. It is correct that the record from control room concerning to attending the said call by us was not given to the police. It is correct that police did not record my statement. It is correct that we did not hand over the police the reports sent from my office to my superior office for final opinion. It is incorrect that final report accordingly issued falsely.

7. I do not know the time when the FIR was lodged. It is incorrect that I was not aware about in which crime I conducted the said inspection. It is correct that our team visited prior to registration of FIR. It is correct that afterwards the FIR registration number was entered in my inspection report. It is incorrect that the concerned blanks were later on filled up.

Cross-examination : by Shri. A.K. Shaikh, Adv. for A. No.1.

8. Declined.

Cross-examination : by Shri. G.J. Mitkari, Adv. for A. No.3.

9. It is incorrect that I do not have any certificate about my expertize in finger prints. It is correct that the specimen finger prints are not detailed in the letter about who obtained them etc. It is correct that which eight points were verified and connected, such mention is not found in the final report.

10. It is correct that the spot inspection report at Ext.255 was prepared after registration of FIR. It is incorrect that I have deposed falsely as per examination-in-chief now read over to me.

Cross-examination : by Shri. P.V. Kamble, Adv. for A. No.3.

11. Absent when called. Hence, no cross.

Cross-examination : by Shri. A.C. Gidde, Adv. for A. No.5.

12. Declined.

Re-examination : Nil.

R.O. & A.C.

Date : 20.05.2026.

**(R.R. Bhosale)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Latur.**
