

Dr. Suresh and Others Vs. Wing Commander Ramesh

Dr. Suresh and Others Vs. Wing Commander Ramesh

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1104923

Court : Mumbai Nagpur

Decided On : Mar-04-2013

Judge : M.L. Tahaliyani

Appeal No. : Criminal Application (Apl) No.215 of 2012

Appellant : Dr. Suresh and Others

Respondent : Wing Commander Ramesh

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : Mr. Awchat

Judgement :

Oral Judgment:

Heard Mr. Awchat, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs. Ketki Jaltare, learned counsel for the non-applicant.

2. Admitted. Heard finally by consent of learned counsel for the parties.

3. The applicants are facing trial before the Judicial Magistrate First Class at Ramtek for the offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 420, 465 and 467 of Indian Penal Code along with other connected offences at the instance of the respondent. It is a private complaint case.

4. The respondent had made an application for issuance of summons to the office of Revenue Commissioner for production of the original alleged forged document

which is in the custody of the Additional Revenue Commissioner, Nagpur. The said prayer was opposed by the applicants. The learned trial Court granted the prayer and directed issuance of summons for production of document from the office of Revenue Commissioner.

5. The applicants/original accused have challenged the said order in the present application. It is submitted by Mr.Awchat that the respondent has filed a civil suit pertaining to some property described in the alleged forged document. It is further submitted by Mr.Awchat that the Civil Court is competent to decide the genuineness or otherwise of the document in question. It is contended that it was not necessary for the Criminal Court to call the document.

6. In this regard, it may be stated here that though the civil suit is pending in respect of same property, that does not prevent the trial Court to call the document pertaining to same property from the person in whose custody it is. Ultimately, production of original document is necessary to determine the charge of forgery. The Civil Court cannot punish the culprits for offence of forgery even if it comes to the conclusion that the document relied upon is forged. I do not find any substance in the arguments of Mr.Awchat, learned counsel for the applicant.

7. The learned counsel, Mrs. Jaltare, has submitted that the case is fixed for recording of evidence of hand writing expert on 6.3.2013. It is submitted that the document examiner has already given his opinion in respect of writing in the said document. I am told that the document examiner has not examined the original document but he has examined the photo copy of the original. Probative value of evidence of the document examiner in respect of the opinion given by him on the basis of examination of photo copy of the document is a matter of consideration for the trial court. The issue involved in the present application is only in respect of the power of the trial Court under Section 91 of Code of Criminal Procedure directing production of the document which is necessary for the purposes of trial of the case pending before it. Needless to say that considering the nature of the charges, production of original document was found necessary and the learned Magistrate has rightly issued the summons for production of the said document. No interference is called for. Criminal application stands dismissed.

