

Phool Chand Vs State Bank of India and Others

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: Sept. 27, 2013

Hon'ble Judges: L.N. Mittal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Manjit Singh, for the Appellant; Ashok Gupta, Advocate for Respondent No. 1 and Mr. M.K. Garg, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2 to 9, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

L.N. Mittal, J.

Phool Chand-respondent No. 8 before the lower Appellate Court has filed this revision petition under Article 227 of the

Constitution of India challenging order dated 08.10.2005 passed by the lower Appellate Court, thereby allowing application filed by respondent

No. 1-plaintiff-State Bank of India (appellant before the lower appellate court) for amendment of plaint as well as for additional evidence. Plaintiff

alleged in its application that fraud committed by defendant No. 1-Desh Raj Chawla, an employee of the Bank (since deceased and represented

by legal heirs) came to notice of the Bank on 27.05.1991 but it was wrongly mentioned in the plaint that the said fraud came to the notice of the

Bank on 15.04.1991. Accordingly, correction in the said date was sought by amendment of plaint.

2. As regards additional evidence, it was alleged that Des Raj Chawla had made admission of the fraud by making statement on 20.04.1991

before the investigating authorities. The said confession made by Des Raj Chawla regarding commission of fraud was earlier not in the knowledge

of the plaintiff-Bank. The same is sought to be proved by examining attesting witnesses thereof. It was also alleged that during pendency of the suit,

Vijay Kumar, one of the sons and legal heirs of defendant No. 1-Des Raj Chawla since deceased, gave an affidavit dated 09.05.1997 undertaking

to pay the outstanding amount with interest, which was due from his father defendant No. 1-Des Raj Chawla. Vijay Kumar deposited the said

amount. Vouchers regarding deposit thereof are also sought to be proved by additional evidence.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

4. Counsel for the petitioner contended that amendment of plaint could not be allowed at appellate stage because amendment of pleading cannot

be allowed after commencement of trial unless the party seeking amendment could not have raised the matter before commencement of trial in

spite of due diligence. The contention cannot be accepted because amended provision of Order VI, Rule 17 of the CPC (in short, CPC),

drastically curtailing the right of a party to seek amendment of pleading after commencement of trial, as contended by the counsel for the petitioner,

came into existence in the year 2002 by amendment and the said provision as it now exists is not applicable to the instant case because the suit in

this case had been instituted on 29.04.1994 i.e. long before the aforesaid amended provision of CPC came into existence. Before the said

amended provision came into existence, law of amendment of pleadings was liberal. In the instant case, only date of knowledge of the commission

of fraud is sought to be corrected by amendment of plaint. Even after the said amendment, plaintiff has to prove the amended plea. Consequently,

amendment of plaint has been rightly allowed by the lower Appellate Court.

5. As regards additional evidence, the same consists of documents which are old and are prima facie not likely to be fabricated. On the other hand,

the suit is by Bank and, therefore, no official of the Bank has any personal interest in the case so as to fabricate the documents. Consequently,

proposed additional evidence, which is essential for proper and effective decision of the appeal, has also been rightly allowed by the lower

Appellate Court.

6. In the aforesaid context, it has to be noticed that the petitioner, who is respondent No. 8 in the lower Appellate Court, is mentioned to be ex

parte in the lower Appellate Court in the impugned order. He did not even contest the application filed in the lower Appellate Court by respondent

No. 1 herein.

7. For the reasons aforesaid, I find that there is no perversity, illegality or jurisdictional error in the impugned order of the lower Appellate Court so

as to call for interference by this Court in exercise of power of superintendence under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The revision petition

lacks any merit and is accordingly dismissed. Pending civil miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.