

20 M A C T 248/20
DINESH Vs. GOATAM AND ORS.

25.01.2025

Pr: Ms. Karuna Sharma, Ld. Counsel for petitioner.

None for R1 and R2.

Sh. Chaitana Jain, Ld counsel for R3/Insurance Company.

There is an application filed on behalf of R3, for reopening of evidence. The respondent no. 3 is seeking reopening of the evidence on the ground that as per report of investigator, there was a license in the name of R1 which issued from Agra, which was found to be forged. It is further stated that respondent no. 1 merely got his license renewed from Karnal therefore, since base license was fake therefore, the renewed license cannot be taken into consideration however, there is no report of investigator which shows that license as issued by the Karnal authority is also fake.

Perusal of certified copy of license of R1, prima facie reveals that same has been issued in the year 2005 and it was not a case of renewed license and since as per R3 also, the said license was found to be issued from Karnal therefore, no ground is made out to give any further opportunity to R3, to prove genuineness of the previous license if any issued, in the name of R1. Hence, the application stands dismissed.

Statement under clause 29 of MACTAP of petitioner Dinesh with regard to disbursal of award amount is recorded.

Put up for final arguments on 22.03.2025.

(Shama Gupta)
PO MACT (N/W)
Rohini Courts: Delhi
25.01.2025