

2025:PHHC:127535



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

201

**CRR-407-2008**

**Date of decision: September 15, 2025**

GANGANDEEP SINGH @ SONU @ RAGI

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate (*Amicus Curiae*) and  
Mr. Lovish, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The instant revision petition is directed against the judgment of conviction/order of sentence dated 09.07.2007 passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi, in case FIR No.10 dated 19.01.2006 under Sections 379, 411, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, convicting and sentencing the petitioner, which judgment was upheld by the learned Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, on 04.02.2008, whereby the revisionist Gagandeep Singh has been held guilty for the offence punishable under Section 471 of the IPC and sentenced as follows:-

Offence under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
471 of the IPC	RI for 2 years	Rs.1,500/-	Imprisonment for 15 days



2. Both the Courts below, upon appreciation of the entire material produced before them, have concurrently held that the prosecution has successfully established the case beyond reasonable doubt.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 19.01.2006, a police party headed by ASI Shamsheer Singh (PW1) received secret information that the petitioner Gagandeep Singh @ Sonu along with co-accused Hoshiar Singh and one Naveen Kumar, were in possession of stolen vehicles and forged registration certificates at Chowk Tashpur. Acting upon this, the police conducted a raid. During the raid, the petitioner was apprehended while driving a Toyota Qualis bearing a fictitious registration No.PB-11-AB-5872 and co-accused Hoshiar Singh was found in an Indica car with fictitious registration No.PB-41-B-7976. The third accused managed to escape from the spot.

4. Upon questioning, neither accused could produce any genuine registration certificate. Both vehicles and their documents were seized. During investigation, it was revealed that the accused had stolen the vehicles from Delhi about 13½ months earlier, and with the assistance of Naveen Kumar, had prepared forged registration certificates. Verification by the registering authorities at Sultanpur Lodhi and Patiala confirmed that the documents were forged and did not bear the signatures of the competent authority.



5. Learned *Amicus Curiae* on behalf of the petitioner has contended that the prosecution version is fabricated, inherently improbable, and unsupported by independent witnesses, despite the alleged recovery being made from a public place. It has been argued that the prosecution failed to prove that the petitioner himself forged the certificates or that he had knowledge of their forged nature. It has also been pointed out that the learned trial Court acquitted the petitioner of the charges under Sections 379 and 468 of the IPC, and therefore, in absence of any finding of theft or forgery, conviction under Section 471 IPC was unsustainable.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, has supported the impugned judgments. It was submitted that possession of vehicles with fictitious registration certificates stands established, and the evidence of PW3 Rattan Singh, Clerk, DTO Office, Patiala and PW4 Kuljeet Singh, Clerk, Office of Registering Authority, Sultanpur Lodhi have categorically proved that the registration certificates were forged and not issued by the competent authority.

7. A prayer has, therefore, been made for dismissing the instant revision petition as the impugned judgments are well-reasoned ones.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the evidence on record.

9. At the outset, it may be noticed that although there is no direct evidence to show that the petitioner himself prepared the forged registration



certificates, the prosecution has convincingly proved that the petitioner was in conscious possession of vehicles affixed with fictitious registration numbers, and that he was using forged documents as genuine.

10. The testimony of PW3 Rattan Singh and PW4 Kuljeet Singh leaves no manner of doubt that the registration certificates in question were not issued by their respective offices. The petitioner was apprehended while driving one such vehicle and failed to account for its genuine ownership or produce any authentic document. The contention that no independent witness was joined at the time of recovery does not vitiate the case of the prosecution. The seizure was effected by the police party, and the evidence of official witnesses cannot be discarded merely for lack of independent corroboration, particularly when their testimony has remained consistent and unshaken in cross-examination.

11. As regards the acquittal of the petitioner under Sections 379 and 468 of the IPC, the same does not enure to his benefit in the present revision petition. The acquittal under those provisions was based on absence of direct proof of theft or the act of forgery committed by the petitioner himself. However, for the offence under Section 471 IPC, what is required to be proved is the use of forged documents as genuine knowing them to be forged. The presence of fictitious certificates in possession of the petitioner, coupled with his failure to explain or justify their authenticity, clearly established knowledge and use of the same.



***CRR-407-2008***

***-5-***

12. The concurrent findings of the learned trial Court and the Lower Appellate Court are based on proper appreciation of evidence. This Court finds no perversity, illegality, or infirmity warranting interference in the present revision petition.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds no merit in the instant petition. The conviction of the petitioner recorded by both the Courts below is affirmed.

14. At his stage, the only question that therefore survives for consideration is that of sentence. It is undisputed fact that the incident in question pertains to the year 2006. During this entire period, the petitioner has faced the ordeal of protracted criminal proceedings. It is also not disputed that he has not been involved in any other criminal case either prior to or after the occurrence, and has maintained good conduct. The petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of 9 months.

15. Having regard to the aforesaid circumstances, including the long passage of time since the incident, the clean antecedents of the petitioner, and the period of imprisonment already undergone as per the custody certificate placed on record by the learned State counsel, this Court is of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be adequately met by reducing the substantive sentence to the period already undergone.



16. Accordingly, while upholding the conviction of the petitioner, the substantive sentence of two years' rigorous imprisonment awarded to him is hereby reduced to the period already undergone i.e. 9 months.

17. However, there shall be no modification with regard to the fine imposed.

18. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, the instant revision petition stands disposed of.

**September 15, 2025**

*Jaspreet Kaur*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE**

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

*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*