

105 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.438 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 04, 2016

Anoop Kumar Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present revision is the judgment dated 31.10.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, affirming the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 18.11.2014 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalandhar, vide which the accused-petitioner was convicted and sentenced as under:

Sr. No.	Offence Punishable u/s	Sentence (R.I.)	Fine (₹)	In default of Fine (S.I.)
1	420 IPC	1 year	1,000/-	3 months
2	465 IPC	6 months	500/-	1 month
3	466 IPC	1 year	1,000/-	3 months
4	467 IPC	2 years	2,000/-	3 months
5	468 IPC	1 year	1,000/-	3 months
6	471 IPC	6 months	500/-	1 month

All the substantive sentences were directed to run concurrently.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

It comes out that there are serious allegations against the accused-petitioner. One Raju Mahato, was facing trial before the lower court. To obtain bail, the present petitioner stood his surety and one Sucha Singh represented to be Lambardar appeared as a witness. However, it was found that present petitioner had produced a forged copy of the jamabandi and the signatures of the Patwari were also forged. The identity card produced by Sucha Singh was also found to be forged. The matter was got verified from the Tehsildar by the Court and on the complaint of the court, the present case was registered.

Before the lower court, the evidence was led to the effect that jamabandi produced by the present petitioner was forged and that the identity card produced by Sucha Singh was also forged. However, the fact remains that Raju Mahato, who was got released by producing fake documents, had absconded in this case also and was declared P.O. and could not be apprehended.

The judgments of both the courts below are well reasoned and based on documentary evidence. Thus, there is no ground to interfere in the same.

Hence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

February 04, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE