



WEB COPY

A No. 2 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-02-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

**A No. 2 of 2026
in TOS No.63 of 2024**

1. K.Venkat Rangam
S/o.K.Mohan Rao, No.2/739, 6th Cross
Street, Kazura Garden, Neelankarai,
Thiruvanmiyur, Chennai - 600 041.

Applicant(s)

Vs

1. Y.Rajasekar
S/o.Y.Lakshminarasimhulu, Flat F2,
Srinivasa Castle, No.11, Radhakrishnan
Street, Villivakkam, Chennai 600 049.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Application is filed to receive the Forensic Report dated 15/05/2024 into the file of T.O.S.No.63 of 2024.

For Applicant(s): M/S.C Prasanna Venkatesh

For Respondent: Mr.V.Anil Kumar

ORDER

This application has been filed by the applicant / plaintiff to receive the forensic report dated 15.05.2024.

2. The learned counsel for the applicant / plaintiff submitted that in order to prove the authenticity of the Will, the plaintiff has approached “Truth Labs –



Forensic Services” to verify and confirm the signature of the testatrix affixed in the Will and the “Truth Labs – Forensic Services” given their report on

15.05.2024, confirming that the signature in the Will dated 20.08.2021 is that of the person who is said to have executed the Will. By stating that the above document would support the case of the plaintiff, the plaintiff has come out with this application.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent / defendant submitted that the true and genuineness of the Will has to be proved only in accordance with Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act and the applicant cannot be allowed to take shelter by producing the mere forensic report. It is further submitted that the report has been given by not comparing the signatures between the contemporary documents but the documents pertaining to different timelines.

4. No doubt, the Will has to be proved only in accordance with Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act. Even by allowing the applicant / plaintiff to produce the scientific report, the Court cannot conclude that the Will has been proved unless the mandates of Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act is complied. It is a settled proposition of law that the report of the handwriting expert is not a conclusive proof.



5. The vital objection that has been made by the learned counsel for the respondent is that the comparison has been made not only between the documents which pertains to a different time line but also with the photocopies.

The report of the scientific expert can be allowed to be received as that of any other piece of papers that might be filed by the plaintiff along with his pleadings. So far as the report is filed as original, the Court can receive the documents, however, subject to proof and relevancy. By allowing the applicant to produce the documents, will not in any way prevent the respondent / defendant to raise his objection as to the relevancy and the mode of proof of Will and those objection can be raised when the document is going to be a let-in evidence.

6. In view of the above observation, this application is disposed and the document is allowed to be received subject to proof and relevancy.

02-02-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

bkn



WEB COPY

A No. 2 of 2026



R.N.MANJULA J.

bkn

**A No. 2 of 2026
In TOS No.63 of 2024**

02-02-2026