

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7556-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.03.2024

Baljender Singh @ Valjender Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Jai Vir Yadav, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Nitish Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner assails order dated 20.11.2023 (Annexure P-4), whereby learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad has dismissed the revision petition filed by the petitioner challenging order dated 11.07.2022 (Annexure P-3) vide which learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad had proceeded to frame charges against the petitioner with respect to offences under Sections 467, 468, 471, 201 & 120-B IPC and Section 66-C of the IT Act in case FIR No.383 dated 11.04.2018 registered at Police Station Centre Faridabad.
2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that there is no evidence worth credence on record so as to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence and as a matter of fact as many as 8 out of 11 accused have been discharged by the learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad i.e. the Revisional Court and that under these circumstances, the petitioner, who is also identically situated, deserves to be discharged.

3. This Court has considered the aforesaid submissions and has carefully gone through the impugned orders as well as other documents annexed with the petition.
4. The controversy in hand hinges around the allegations pertaining to forgery of certain documents submitted with Excise & Taxation Department. During the course of investigation, the police claims to have recovered a laptop at the instance of the petitioner in which some data was found to be stored pertaining to the allegedly forged treasury receipts. Though it has been vehemently argued on behalf of the petitioner that no sanctity can be attached to such like recovery and that it cannot be said with certainty that the laptop actually belonged to the petitioner or that he had purchased the same or that he was using the same, but at this stage this Court is of the opinion that it *prima facie* sufficient to suggest the complicity of the petitioner particularly when the data with respect to the forged documents was found to be stored in the laptop recovered at the instance of the petitioner. As such, this Court does not find any infirmity or illegality in the impugned order dated 20.11.2023 (Annexure P-4) and the same is accordingly upheld. Finding no merit in the petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

14.03.2024

Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**
Whether reportable: **Yes/No**