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# Article summary:

1. The Indian Evidence Act does not define what a presumption is, but Stephen defines it as a rule of law that courts and Judges shall draw a particular inference from a particular fact or evidence.

2. Section 79 to 90 of the Evidence Act discuss various presumptions that may arise when documents are produced in evidence. Some are obligatory while others are permissive.

3. Section 90 provides that when any document purporting or proved to be 30 years old is produced in court from proper custody, the court may presume that the signature and every other part of such document is in the handwriting of the person whose signature it purports to be, and was duly executed and attested by those persons by whom it purports to be executed and attested.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article provides an overview of the legal provisions related to presumption as documents 30 years old under Indian Evidence Act. The article is well-structured with clear explanations for each section discussed, along with illustrations for better understanding. The article also provides an explanation for what constitutes ‘proper custody’ for documents under this section.

However, there are some potential biases in the article which should be noted. Firstly, there is no mention of counterarguments or alternative perspectives on this topic which could have been explored further. Secondly, there is no discussion on possible risks associated with relying on such presumptions which could have been included in order to provide a more balanced view on this topic. Thirdly, there is no mention of any sources used for information presented in the article which could have added credibility to its claims. Lastly, there is no discussion on how these provisions apply in different contexts or scenarios which could have provided more insight into their practical implications.

In conclusion, while the article provides an overview of legal provisions related to presumption as documents 30 years old under Indian Evidence Act, it lacks depth and fails to explore alternative perspectives or discuss possible risks associated with relying on such presumptions which limits its trustworthiness and reliability.

# Topics for further research:

* Counterarguments to presumption as documents 30 years old
* Risks associated with relying on presumption as documents 30 years old
* Practical implications of presumption as documents 30 years old
* Sources for information on presumption as documents 30 years old
* Application of presumption as documents 30 years old in different contexts
* Alternative perspectives on presumption as documents 30 years old
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