IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Revision No. 791 of 2017

Manish Kumar, Son of Sri Vinod Kumar Bhagat @ Sri Binod Prasad Bhagat, resident of village-Dhamsai, P.O. Chapri, P.S. Pathargama, Dist.-Godda **... .... Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **.... .... Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the petitioner : Mr. Rohan Mazumdar, Advocate
Mr. Aniket Jaiswal, Adv.
Mr. Hammad Ahmed Ansari, Adv.

For the State : Mr. Abhay Kr. Tiwary, A.P.P

J UDGMENT

Dated: 21st August, 2026
By Court:-

1. Heard the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner and Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. The instant criminal revision is preferred against the judgment dated 08th May, 2017 passed in Cr. Appeal No. 17 of 2014 by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Sahibganj, whereby and whereunder, the learned Appellate Court has dismissed the appeal filed against the judgment and order of conviction and sentence dated 21.01.2014 passed in G.R. No. 564 of 2011 (T.R. No. 241 of 2013) by the learned S.D.J.M., Sahibganj, whereby and whereunder, the petitioner has been convicted and sentenced to undergo R.I. for 1 year along with a fine of Rs. 1,000/- under Section 471 of the IPC, with default stipulation.

Factual Matrix:-

3. The factual matrix giving rise to this case is that the petitioner joined as Block Agriculture Officer, Barhait on 07.12.2011 in the

light of letter No. 3649 dated 21.11.2011 issued by Director, Agriculture Dept., Krishi Bhawan Campus, Kanke Road, Ranchi. After joining of the petitioner, the informant –Sanjay Kumar Prasad (B.D.O., Barhait) enquired into the matter and found that such appointment letter has not been issued by Director, Agriculture Dept., Krishi Bhawan Campus, Kanke Road, Ranchi and was a fraudulent letter.

On the basis of above written report of Informant, Barhait P.S. Case No. 119 of 2011 was registered for the offence under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) of the IPC against the present petitioner.

After completion of investigation, charge-sheet was submitted against the petitioner and accordingly, cognizance was taken and the case was transferred for trial and disposal. The aforesaid charges were framed and read over and explained to the accused in Hindi to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

4. In the course of trial, altogether five witnesses were examined by the prosecution, apart from the documentary evidence.
5. On the other hand, no oral or documentary evidence has been adduced by the defence. The case of the defence is denial from the occurrence.
6. The learned trial Court after considering the evidence available on record held the petitioner guilty as sated above which was also affirmed by the learned Appellate Court.

Submissions on behalf of petitioner: -

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner without touching the merits of the judgment passed by the learned appellate Court as well as learned trial Court has confined his argument towards the quantum of sentence awarded to the petitioner. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is of joining as Block Agriculture Officer on the basis of forged document but on the very first day of joining, the aforesaid joining letter was found to be forged and did not receive any salary and no detriment was caused to the department. It has further been submitted that the petitioner has remained in custody for about two months and the occurrence is of the year 2011 and since then, the petitioner is facing the agony of the trial who has sufficiently been punished for his guilt. Therefore, it is submitted that the petitioner may be sentenced for the period already undergone by him instead of awarding substantive sentence of imprisonment as awarded by the Courts below.

Submissions on behalf of the State

8. Per contra, Learned A.P.P. has defended the judgment of learned trial Court as well as the appellate Court on merits. So far as quantum of sentence is concerned, it is submitted that the petitioner has remained in custody for about two months, hence appropriate order may be passed for the ends of justice.

Analysis, reasons and decision:

9. I have gone through the record of case along with impugned judgment passed by the learned Appellate Court as well as trial Court in the light of contentions raised on behalf of respective parties.

10. It appears from the testimony of prosecution witnesses as well as the documentary evidence as exhibited in this case that the present petitioner by producing forged document, joined as Block Agriculture Officer in Barhait, Sahibganj and the learned Courts below have rightly come to the conclusion of guilt of the petitioner. Therefore, the conviction of the petitioner passed by the learned trial Court and upheld by the learned appellate Court as stated above is hereby affirmed.

11. So far as the sentence of the petitioner is concerned, it appears that the petitioner has remained in custody for two months and suffered long agony of the trial who has sufficiently been punished for his guilt. Therefore, it appears that no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner again in jail for sustaining the rest of the imprisonment. Hence, it appears expedient, for the ends of justice to modify/alter the sentence of the petitioner.

12. Accordingly, the sentence of the petitioner is modified to the extent of period already undergone by him.

13. In result, the instant criminal revision is **dismissed on merits with modification in sentence** as stated above.
14. Petitioner is on bail, hence, he is discharged from the liabilities of bail bonds. The sureties are also discharged.
15. Pending I.A(s), if any, is also disposed of, accordingly.
16. Let a copy of this judgment along with Trial Court Records be sent back to the court concerned for information and needful.

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

21.08.2026
Basant/
Uploaded On: 24/08/2026