

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

112

**CRR No. 386 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.02.2019**

Naginder Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(ORAL)

This revision petition has been filed against concurrent conviction of the petitioner in case FIR No. 67, dated 09.02.2014, under Sections 170, 171, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Qadian.

As per FIR police had received secret information that the co-accused were posing to be high police officers of Maharashtra and were duping people of the money by promising them jobs in the Maharashtra Police. It was further informed that they were presently in the vicinity of village Kot Todermal and if timely action was taken, they could be apprehended. The police reached the place and saw a white coloured Innova with official yellow light which was signaled to stop in which two co-accused were sitting in the uniform of Maharashtra Police while the petitioner was in plain clothes and was driving the vehicle. The identity cards which were handed over by them were found to be forged. In these circumstances, the case was registered. Both the Courts held that

by posing as Maharashtra Police Officers, the accused were guilty of the offence charged with. As regards the petitioner, it was found that the vehicle belongs to him and one of the co-accused was of his village and the above facts clearly reveal his complicity in the offence. The only argument today raised before me is that the petitioner was not in the uniform of Maharashtra Police and no recovery was made from him. In the circumstances of the present case the said argument has no relevance, once the petitioner was found driving the car in which two persons posing to be Police men were caught and one of them was from his village. It was for the petitioner to explain the circumstances in which he happened to be in car. The Courts below, to my mind, have rightly held the petitioner guilty after invoking the provisions of Section 120-B IPC. In the end, the learned counsel prayed for some reduction in the sentence of imprisonment (which has already been reduced by the appellate Court). No further reduction is justified.

Dismissed.

February 13, 2019

Poonam Sharma

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No