

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**CRM-M-27763 of 2013
Date of Decision: 15.01.2015**

Krishan Kumar

---Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

**Present: Mr.Aman Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner**

**Mr. Ankur Jain, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State**

**Mr. TVS Lehal, Advocate
for respondent No.4**

**Mr. Sham Lal Bhalla, Advocate
for respondent No. 5**

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

REKHA MITTAL, J.

The present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been preferred for issuance of directions to respondent No. 2 to 4 to take action on the complainants of the petitioner as respondent No. 5 has committed a serious offence.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a senior citizen and is resident of Mandi Ahmadgarh, District Sangrur. The

petitioner and his wife are being harassed by the officers/officials of Municipal Council, Ahmadgarh in regard to assessment/payment of house tax pertaining to their property. It is argued that respondent No. 5 has forged the signatures of the petitioner on application dated 29.4.2011 (Annexure P-3) and, therefore he has committed a cognizable offence and liable to be prosecuted for the said offence.

Counsel for respondent No. 5 would submit that Annexure P-3 is an application for supply of copy of TS-I form pertaining to property No. 265/8 and such an application can be filed by any person on behalf of the petitioner to obtain the said form which is meant for deposit of house tax in the office of Municipal Council. It is argued with vehemence that after processing of that application and receipt of fee of Rs. 100/-, the said form was supplied to the representative of the petitioner. It is argued that there was no reason or occasion for respondent No. 5 to forge signatures of the petitioner on an application for supply of copy of TS-I form.

In reply, counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to controvert the submissions made by counsel for the contesting respondent that any person can file an application for supply of copy of TS-I form on behalf of the petitioner.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

There is no material on record to substantiate plea of the petitioner that respondent No. 5 has forged his signatures on the application (Annexure P-3) or he had any reason whatsoever to forge his signatures or obtain TS-I form in regard to his property. It further appears to the court that as the petitioner has some other grievance against respondent No. 5, he

has misused the process of Court to get initiated criminal proceedings against him.

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is dismissed leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

15.01.2015

PARAMJIT