



conviction. For, mere production of documents is not enough. The documents need to be proved in evidence only when the same would become admissible and can be reckoned by the Court.

The petitioner had moved an application for seeking permission to adduce evidence being criminal M.A. No. 17105 of 2010 which was rejected on 29.02.2012.

The petitioner had then moved an application in March, 2016 in Criminal M.A. No. 4506 of 2016 which has been rejected vide impugned judgment by the High Court.

We will not interfere with the impugned order, but in the interest of justice, it would be appropriate to give liberty to the petitioner to approach the High Court by way of formal application for permission to produce further evidence in support of his stand/defence on the basis of documents which have come to his notice two-three years after the date of his conviction. That application can be considered by the High Court on its own merit and in accordance with law uninfluenced by the rejection of the earlier applications to enable the petitioner to take plea available to him in law or on proved facts for doing complete justice.

The special leave petition is disposed of with

liberty as aforesaid.

Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(DEEPAK SINGH)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(PARVEEN KUMARI PASRICHA)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR