

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

**CRR No.4475 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : July 06, 2017**

Sehjad **..... Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana **..... Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Deepanshu Matya, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. D.R. Singla, DAG, Haryana.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper 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 ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The present revision petition is directed against the judgment dated 24.05.2016 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Mewat, affirming the judgment of conviction dated 28.04.2016 and order of sentence dated 05.05.2016 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Mewat, vide which the accused-revisionist was convicted and sentenced as under:

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Offence</i>	<i>Sentence</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>In default of payment of fine</i>
1	420 IPC	R.I. for two years	--	--
2	468 IPC	R.I. for two years	--	--
3	471 IPC	R.I. for two years	--	--
4	120-B IPC	R.I. for six months	--	--

All the sentences were directed to run concurrently.

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

Learned counsel for the revisionist has produced the custody certificate of the revisionist to show that he has undergone more one year and five months till today. Therefore, he has prayed for reduction in the sentence.

The facts on file show that in order of get interim bail of his brother for the commission of offence punishable under Section 304-B IPC, the present revisionist produced a fake invitation card and affidavit to show that his brother Fakruddin was to be married with Safia on 06.05.2015 and Sehjad Khan with Heena Begam on 16.05.2015. On inquiry, it was found that Fakruddin was already married with Safia and that no marriage of Sehjad with Heena Begam was fixed on 16.05.2015. Even in the defence evidence, Fakruddin had admitted that his marriage with Safia was broken and later on solmenized on 16.07.2015. He was not aware of the printing of his wedding card by his brother. In this case, neither Heena Begam nor Safia were examined nor any Nikahnama was produced to prove the actual date of marriage. There are concurrent findings of two courts below.

Keeping in view the fact that the fake documents were produced before the court for getting the bail, there is no ground to reduce the sentence. Thus, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

July 06, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No