

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Crl. Revision No. 327 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.1.2015

Balbir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. G.S.Nahel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SABINA, J.

Petitioner had faced the trial qua commission of offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) in FIR No. 160 dated 1.7.2008, registered at Police Station City Sangrur. Trial Court vide judgment/order dated 1.3.2014 ordered the conviction and sentence of the petitioner under Section 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC. In appeal, filed by the petitioner, the Appellate Court vide order dated 19.12.2014 reduced the sentence qua imprisonment of the petitioner to rigorous imprisonment of one year under Section 420 IPC and rigorous imprisonment of one year under Section 471 IPC. The amount of fine deposited under Section 467, 468 IPC, if any, was ordered to be refunded to the petitioner. Hence, the present petition by the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record available on the file carefully.

In the present case, petitioner had applied for the post

of Mechanic Agricultural Machinery. Petitioner placed reliance on a forged driving licence bearing No. 04043 dated 5.9.2005 alleged to have been issued by District Transport Office, Sangrur, to get the job. The appointment letter was produced on record as Ex. PE and as per the same, the candidate was required to hold driving licence authorizing him to drive heavy motor vehicle. Vide Ex. PB, the office of District Transport Officer, Sangrur wrote to Director, Technical Education and Industrial Training Punjab that licence No. 04043 dated 5.9.2005 had not been issued in favour of Balbir Singh son of Labh Singh, resident of Bhai Ki Pishore, Teshil and District Sangrur. Since the driving licence produced by the petitioner was found to be fake, his services were terminated vide letter dated 26.12.2007 (Annexure P-F).

Prosecution led its evidence in support of its case. Both the Courts below after appreciating the evidence on record have held that petitioner had committed offence of cheating and had used a forged document as genuine. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any misreading of evidence by the Courts below.

No ground for interference is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

January 30, 2015

Gurpreet