

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

Crl.Rev.No.307 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision : 8.7.2015

Jangfulwinder Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

....

Present : Mr.Jagram Singh Cooner, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

MAHESH GROVER, J.

This revision petition is directed against the orders dated 1.4.2013 and 29.9.2014 passed by the learned JMIC Mohali and learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Mohali, respectively.

The petitioner during the course of appeal had set up a plea of being juvenile which was negated by the learned trial Court and the appeal also met the same fate. During the course of appeal an application for additional evidence was also preferred which was also declined.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the orders passed by the courts below are erroneous and liable to be set aside. He contends that his mother had appeared, to claim that she had only one son and one daughter and in support thereof she

had placed on record Ex.AW1/1 copy of birth certificate and Ex.AW1/2 a certificate of the High School Examination issued by the Middle Education Board, Uttar Pradesh showing his date of birth as 3.8.1993.

The document Ex.AW1/2 was discarded in view of the reports produced by the prosecution on record as Ex.R-1 and R-2 certificates issued by the Middle Education Board, UP suggesting AW1/2 to be forged and fictitious. Ex.AW1/A was discarded in view of the discrepancy in the name of the petitioner in the birth certificate. The name of the petitioner is Jangfulwinder Singh whereas the certificate shows his name as Fulwinder Singh. No other evidence was produced by the petitioner to show that the birth certificate produced pertained to him in view of the discrepancy. The sole testimony of the mother of the petitioner while appearing as a witness stating that she had no other son except the petitioner is of no consequence when no corroborative evidence was produced in this regard.

In view of the above circumstances, in the revisional jurisdiction this Court cannot interfere but sustain the orders passed by the courts below considering the fact that there was unexplained discrepancy in the name of the petitioner indicated in the birth certificate and in view of the forged nature of the school certificate.

No ground to interfere.

Dismissed.

8.7.2015

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

dss