

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**C.R.M-M No.16010-2015 (O&M)  
Date of Decision : 14.08.2015**

Nathu Ram

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI**

\*\*\*

Present : Mr. Ghulam Nabi Malik, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

**AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)**

By this petition the petitioner has sought quashing of FIR No.64 dated 07.09.2009, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Ghanaur, District Patiala qua him.

The land was owned by the complainant and his brother Amarjit Singh. Said Amarjit Singh died on 11.07.2003. The petitioner was appointed as Patwari in the year 2007. Thereafter some persons applied for copy of the Jamabandi. The petitioner gave that Jamabandi and, since no body had reported the death of Amarjit Singh, the Jamabandi still contained a recital that the land was owned in half share by Amarjit Singh. It is stated that one of the person who had obtained the Jamabandi impersonated Amarjit Singh and got a loan

sanctioned fraudulently and it is thereafter that the complainant came to know of this fraud.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that upto the time when the petitioner was posted at the place, neither the complainant or any body else had not reported that Amarjit Singh had died and that is why his name continued to remain on the revenue record. When some person applied for the revenue record the petitioner gave that revenue record to him and if that person misused that document in any manner the petitioner cannot be held liable only because he has supplied a copy of the record. Learned DAG has not been able to dispute these factual submissions. He has accepted that the petitioner has been involved in the case only because he issued the Jambandi and that there is no evidence on the record that the petitioner knew that Amarjit Singh had died. In these circumstances I find that even if all the allegations taken in the FIR are taken to be correct, in view of this admitted position no offence can be shown to have been committed by the petitioner.

The petition is allowed and the FIR No.64 dated 07.09.2009, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Ghanaur, District Patiala and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Criminal Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

**August 14, 2015**  
*pooja sharma-I*

**( AJAY TEWARI )**  
**JUDGE**