

**(1997) 10 NCDRC CK 0010**

**NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION**

**Case No:** None

NIC	APPELLANT
	Vs
AVTAR SINGH	RESPONDENT

**Date of Decision:** Oct. 16, 1997

**Citation:** 1997 3 CPJ 412 : 1998 1 CPC 49

**Hon'ble Judges:** P.N.Nag , I.D.Bali , Krishana Tandon J.

**Final Decision:** Application dismissed

**Judgement**

1. BY this application, the applicant/appellant wants to lead additional evidence under Order 18, Rule 17, C.P.C. to demonstrate that the driving licence was forged.

2. MR. L.C. Kapoor, learned Counsel for the applicant/appellant has relied upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in a case Natha Singh & Ors. v. The Financial Commissioner, Taxation, Punjab & Ors., AIR 1976 SC 1053.

At the very outset, it may be pointed out that this authority refers to Order 41, Rule 27, C.P.C. and not Order 18, Rule 17, C.P.C. At any rate, the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is that the true test to be applied in dealing with applications for additional evidence is whether the Appellate Court is able to pronounce judgment on the materials before it, without taking into consideration the additional evidence sought to be adduced.

On the basis of the evidence produced by the parties before the District Forum, we find no difficulty in pronouncing the judgment on such material and as such, no additional evidence can be permitted. In fact, to us, this application of the applicant/appellant seems to be angrier-thought and intended to fill up the lacuna

at this belated stage, which cannot be permitted. The application is wholly misconceived and is dismissed. Application dismissed.