

Evidence Before Charge**Examination-in-chief of CW-2 on oath****Name:** Firoj Issak Shaikh**Age:** 71 years, **Occupation:** Retired,**Address:** Flat No. 1 Kausarbaug Society, Kondwa, Pune.**Examination-in-Chief on behalf of complainant by Advocate Shri D. S. Kale on oath-**

I was working as Assistant State Examiner of document in the office of the Additional Director General of Police, CID crime since 1979 to 2002. And thereafter, as an privet expert. I am graduate in science and completed my in service Post Graduate Diploma in Science of Forensic Science in Document Examination from the Institute of Criminology, Government of India, New Delhi on deputation. Which I passed in 1983. After resuming my duties as examiner of document in my parent office i.e., CID Crime, Maharashtra police, I examined thousands of documents in various criminal cases under investigation from different Police Stations of State of Maharashtra. I have also attended various criminal Courts and Commissions in State of Maharashtra.

2. The documents were referred to me by one Shri Yeshwant J. Kanase r/o Walchandnagar vide latter dt. 28/06/2023 containing the photocopies of documents such as certificate dt. 14/11/2006, order dt. 16/03/2009, Award No. 8590308, Award dt. 14/11/2006, latter dt. 18/05/2011, three statements dt. 14/09/1985, 21/11/1984 and 27/03/1987 and summons dt. 03/11/2008.

3. I have examined photocopies of abovementioned documents. However, I have not examined original documents. So I am only constrain with photocopies referred to me. The above listed documents were containing the five signatures of Recovery Officer, two signatures of Shri Y. J. Kanase and extended Marathi hand writing on five pages. I was also supplied the documents of order dt. 13/09/2000 and statement dt. 21/11/1984 containing therein the admitted signatures of Recovery Officer as well as Shri Y. J. Kanase.

4. During the process of my preliminary examination of the above documents, the documents containing the disputed signature of recovery officer were marked by me as exhibit A-1 to A-5. The signatures of Shri Y. J. Kanase were marked by me as exhibit B-1 and B-2. Similarly admitted signatures of Recovery Officer as were marked by me as AN. Similarly admitted signatures of the Shri Y. J. Kanase were marked by me as BN. The marathi handwriting on five sheets were marked by me as H-1 to H-5.

5. The photocopies of documents now shown to me are same documents examined by me they bear my marking. Therefore, they are collectively marked as **Exhibit 40**.

6. Now I carried my final examination and came to a scientific conclusion that

a) The english signature mark by me as A-1 to A-5 are not written by the writer of the signature mark by me as AN.

b) The marathi writing mark as H-1 to H-5 are shown similarities in respect of certain hand writing characteristics.

c) The signature mark as B-1 and B-2 are not written by the writer of the signature mark as BN.

7. I prepared my report as two parts A and report B both dt. 06/07/2023 and forwarded along with the photocopies of documents to Shri Y. J. Kanase. Now I have shown both report A and B. They are same. It bears my signature. The contents there in are correct. Therefore, both report marked as **Exhibit No. 41 and Exhibit No. 42** respectively.

Examination-in-chief is completed.

Cross Examination on behalf of accused by Advocate Shri N. G. Shaha

(Cross is reserved)

R.O.A.C.

Sd/-

(J. B. Khatawkar)

Date:21/02/2024

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indapur.