



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

**CRR No.2644 of 2006 (O&M)**

**Reserved on: 25.09.2025**

**Pronounced on :30.09.2025**

**Premjit**

**.....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**..... Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

Argued by : Mr. Akhil Kashyap, Advocate for  
Mr. P.K.Kataria, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG, Punjab.

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):**

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 465, 467, 471 and 420 IPC, FIR No.174 dated 23.09.1999, was lodged in Police Station Ropar, and the petitioner was sent to trial. The trial was conducted by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ropar, hereinafter being referred as trial Court, who by virtue of judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 05.10.2004, held the petitioner guilty for the commission of above mentioned offence and passed the following sentence:-

Offence	Imprisonment	Fine	In default of payment of fine
420 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for 1 year	Rs.500/-	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 3 months
468 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for 1 year	Rs.500/	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 3 months
471 IPC	Rigorous	Rs.200/-	Rigorous imprisonment



	imprisonment for 6 months		for a period of 1 month
--	---------------------------	--	-------------------------

2. Aggrieved of the above mentioned judgment of conviction and order of sentence, the petitioner had preferred an appeal in the Court of Sessions, hereinafter being referred as Appellate Court. However, the appeal preferred by the petitioner did not find favour in Appellate Court, and thus, by virtue of order dated 02.06.2006, the appeal has been dismissed.

3. Aggrieved of the above mentioned judgment of conviction and order of sentence, passed by the learned trial Court, and the judgment with regard to dismissal of appeal, passed by the learned Appellate Court, the petitioner has preferred this revision petition. It has been pleaded by the petitioner that both the Courts below have committed an error of judgment, while holding that the charges against the petitioner had been duly proved in accordance with the standard prescribed under the law. According to petitioner, the evidence adduced by the respondent-State was not sufficient and good enough to draw an inference that charges against the petitioner stood proved beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubts, and thus, the petitioner was entitled for acquittal.

4. In nut-shell the facts emerging from record are that the above mentioned FIR came into being against the petitioner in response to a letter written by unknown persons to Director General of Police, Punjab. It was alleged, by virtue of above mentioned complaint, that constable Premjit Singh son of Piara Lal No.9007, District Ropar, had wrongly shown his date of birth as 04.07.1953, instead of 04.07.1952. As per prosecution, on receipt of above mentioned letter, an inquiry was conducted, and thereafter, the FIR was lodged



and during the course of investigation, the allegations contained in the letter were found to be true which led to prosecution of the petitioner.

5. Heard.

6. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that by false projection of facts a wrong story has been set up by the prosecution, and that the story set out by the prosecution has been wrongly believed by the learned trial Court. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the settled principles of law, which requires proof of charges beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubts, have been ignored by the learned trial Court vis-a-vis Appellate Court, and that the above mentioned approach adopted by the trial Court, vis-a-vis Appellate Court, have resulted into miscarriage of justice. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the entire evidence comprised of official witnesses which were not trust worthy for want of independent corroborations.

7. In the alternative, learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is already 72 years old and that the sentence awarded to the petitioner is imprisonment up to one year, which he has already undergone. According to learned counsel for the petitioner an adverse order passed by the learned trial Court, vis-a-vis learned Appellate Court, is having an adverse impact on the retiral benefits of the petitioner and, therefore, there is need for intervention and indulgence of revisional jurisdiction of this Court.

8. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner has knocked the door of this Court by way of revision petition and that the law prescribes that in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction the scope of interference, by the revisional Court is very limited. According to learned



counsel counsel for the respondent-State there is no apparent technical or other defect in the trial conducted by the learned trial Court and, therefore, the evidence adduced by the prosecution cannot be treated to be good enough to inspire confidence. As per learned State counsel there is no scope for indulgence and interference in the impugned verdict.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that following point of determination was framed by the learned trial Court: Whether in the year 1981, the accused forged a certain document i.e. matriculation date of birth certificate intending that it shall be used for the purpose of cheating and thereafter he fraudulently used the same as genuine knowing fully well that the same is a forged document, and cheated the police department, Punjab by using the offence punishable under Sections 468, 471 and 420 IPC.

11. To prove above mentioned point of determination, the prosecution had examined as many as 8 witnesses. The star witness of the prosecution was PW1, an official of Duplicate Certificate Branch of Punjab School Education Board, Mohali. The above named official had proved that as per record, being maintained by Punjab Education Board Mohali, the date of birth of the petitioner was 04.07.1952 and not 04.07.1953.

12. To provide support and corroboration to the above mentioned statement of PW-1, the prosecution had examined Senior Clerk of Municipal Council, namely Ramdas, as PW-2. On the basis of municipal record the PW-2 had proved the birth certificate of the petitioner, wherein his date of birth was recorded as 04.07.1952. For further support and corroboration to the above mentioned evidence, the Clerk of Government Senior Secondary School,



where the petitioner had studied, was examined as PW-3. On the basis of school record, the PW-3, too, had proved the date of birth of the petitioner as 04.07.1952.

13. On the basis of above mentioned consistent evidence of three public departments who used to maintain various documents containing date of birth, it was established that date of birth of petitioner was 04.07.1952.

14. In order to prove that in service record the petitioner had shown his date of birth to be 04.07.1953 the prosecution had examined DSP Sukhwinder as PW-4 and ASI Desraj PW7, who had proved the service record of the petitioner wherein the date of birth of petitioner was recorded as 04.07.1953.

15. As far as the above mentioned evidence adduced by the prosecution is concerned a careful analysis of the same shows that the consistent documentary evidence produced by the prosecution, which was duly supported by the testimony of witnesses, had established that actual date of birth of petitioner was 04.07.1952, but in the service record he had reported it to be 04.07.1953.

16. In view of the above mentioned facts and circumstances, in my considered opinion the learned trial Court vis-a-vis the learned Appellate Court had drawn a right conclusion that there was sufficient and reliable evidence to prove charge against the petitioner, and that the prosecution has been successful in discharging its burden qua the solitary point of determination framed by the trial Court. Thus, it is hereby held that there is no scope of indulgence and interference in the findings returned by the learned trial Court with regard to guilt of the petitioner.



17. As a sequel to above mentioned observations it is hereby held that the judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the learned trial Court deserves to be upheld and there is no scope for interference in the above mentioned finding. Thus qua above mentioned component it is hereby held that the present petitioner is devoid of merit and deserves dismissal.

18. As far as the second component, i.e. quantum of sentence, is concerned in view of the fact that the petitioner was a public servant and with regard to his service record he had committed forgery, it is hereby held that he is not entitled for admonition or probation. Otherwise also the order of sentence shows that already very lenient view has been taken against the petitioner. Thus, it is hereby held that qua second component also there is no scope for interference. Hence, qua this component also the revision petition deserves dismissal.

19. As a sequel to above mentioned observations, it is hereby held that the revision petition preferred by the petitioner deserves dismissal. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

**(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**30.09.2025**

*Manoj Bhutani*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No