



CRM-M-31033-2019

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

CRM-M-31033-2019

Date of Decision: 01.07.2025

Ravi Dutt

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. K.S. Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Geeteshwar Saini, Advocate for
Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

1. Seeking action under Section 195 r/w 340 CrPC, the petitioner has come up before this Court under Section 482 CrPC.

2. The petitioner and the private respondent appear to be chronic litigants amongst each other. They have been working in same fire department and appears to have filed multiple cases against each other and this petition is also one such case. Perusal of the present petition reveals that again entire history has been mentioned which has nothing to do with the relief sought, as such this Court is not referring to unnecessary pleadings and is focusing straightway to the point in issue i.e. 195 CrPC.

3. Petitioner's grievance is that respondent has committed an offence by filing false affidavit which he filed without disclosing the true facts in filing of the petition in this Court, as such respondent No.4 is liable to be prosecuted under Section 195 r/w 340 CrPC. Petitioner anchors his case that CRM-M No.26211 of 2019 titled 'Dilbag Singh vs State of Punjab and others' was by respondent No.4 for issuance of directions to official respondents to conduct inquiry against the present petitioner for holding fake driving licence and getting promotion on the basis of said forged driving licence. Allegations of the petitioner are that respondent No.4 wrongly pleaded in this petition that he never filed such like petition before this Court, however CWP No.8722 of



CRM-M-31033-2019

2014 and CRM-M No.9883 of 2014 were filed by respondent No.4. Petitioner has annexed copy of the said petition as Annexure P-10.

4. Petitioner's grievance is that although petitioner had already superannuated, respondent on the same allegations filed another petition whereas in para no.13, it was explicitly mentioned that no such petition was filed earlier, as such this Court was mis-led and based on such mis-information, the Court passed an order to decide the representation, hence prosecution under Section 195 r/w 340 CrPC. Cross petition filed by Dilbag Singh was also listed today along with the present petition. It has been mentioned that both Dilbag and Ravi Dutt stood retired from their respective job. Even if every word of the petitioner's pleadings is accepted to be true and even it is accepted that filing of the earlier petition was not mentioned, still it is not a case to prosecute under Section 195 r/w 340 CrPC. It is also not the case that the petition filed by Dilbag Singh was identical and replica of the earlier petition. Only order which this Court had passed was to decide the representation which has already been decided wherein ample opportunity by the Investigator was given. Perusal of the order Annexure P-3 dated 20.03.2014 clearly shows that petitioner was granted liberty to file fresh petition. Thus, it cannot be said that the omission to mention the previous cases was intentional.

5. Given above, no case is made out to initiate prosecution under Section 195 r/w 340 CrPC and the petition is dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

01.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.