



204 (03 case)

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

CRR-2621-2014

Date of Decision:21.04.2026

Dharminder Sachdeva

...Petitioner

Vs.

Love Sachdeva and Anr.

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Sumit Tyagi, Advocate for
Mr. L.M Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Walia, Advocate with
Mr. Akramjit Singh Ahluwalia, Advocate
for the respondent No.1.

Mr. Bhanu Partap Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J.

1. The petitioner has filed the present revision petition against the impugned judgment dated 06.06.2014 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track Court), Bathinda and the judgment dated 20.12.2012 passed by the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda, whereby, the respondent No.1 was ordered to be acquitted by the Trial Court as well as the Appellate Court.

2. The brief facts of the present case are that Dharminder Sachdeva, complainant, had moved an application dated 30.8.2005 to the S.S.P, Bathinda for registration of case against accused Love Sachdeva son of Ram Chand Sachdeva, by stating that he is working as SDE in BSNL Bathinda. On 8.4.2005 Love Sachdeva caused injuries on his head and left arm with a bat with



intention to kill him. He remained admitted in the Civil Hospital, Bathinda w.e.f. 8.4.2005 to 22.4.2005. FIR was registered against Love Sachdeva under sections 308/325 of IPC, P.S. Kotwali, Bathinda. That both of his sisters came to meet him in the hospital on 9.4.2005 and they handed over him a Panchayati Razinama (compromise deed) written on a stamp paper. They asked him to sign the said compromise deed otherwise they would not keep any relation with him. Complainant found that the said paper was purchased from Bhola Nath Stamp Vendor on 9.4.2005 vide Sr. No.192 by Love Sachdeva, by impersonating the complainant. Love Sachdeva forged the signature of complainant on the back of the document. He has suspicion that Love Sachdeva must have forged more documents in the name of complainant. The accused was trying to go abroad, so action may be taken against him. On the above application, inquiry was conducted by DSP(D) and after obtaining opinion of DDA (Legal), an offence u/s 465 IPC was added in FIR No.202 dated 9.4.2005 u/s 308/325 IPC but the complainant was not satisfied with the same and he had moved another application to the D.I.G. Bathinda Range, seeking opinion from the DDA (Legal) of some other District. The said application was marked to District Attorney, Bathinda, on which he has given legal opinion that prima-facie offense u/s 465/419/181/182 IPC is made out. Upon that, the present case was registered. The accused was arrested and after completion of necessary investigation, challan against the accused was presented in the court.

3. After perusing the challan and other accompanying documents, the Court found that a prima facie case under Sections 419,465,181,182 of IPC was made out against the respondent No.1 and he was charge-sheeted accordingly. However, he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried by the Trial Court.



4. In order to prove the charge against the respondent No.1, the prosecution examined 06 witnesses.

5. After the closure of the prosecution evidence, the statement of respondent No.1 was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C and all the incriminating evidence was put to him, to which he pleaded that they had been falsely involved in the present case. No defence evidence was led by respondent No.1 in his defence.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the judgment passed by both the Courts were wrong and unsustainable. In fact, an enquiry was conducted by DSP (D) and the allegations were found to be correct. Thereafter, another application was moved to the higher police officers and again it was found that the offence under Sections 419,465,181,182 of IPC was made out against the respondent No.1. Even, the challan was presented against respondent No.1. Thereafter, the charge under Sections 419,465,181,182 of IPC was ordered to be framed against respondent No.1 by the Trial Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner further vehemently argued that in the present case, the petitioner had fully supported the case of the prosecution and even, the allegations levelled by him were found to be correct, during investigation. Apart from that, the statement of petitioner as PW-1, PW-2 Bawa Singh, I.O of the present case, PW-3 JTO Bhola Nath Stamp Vendor, PW-5 Head Constable Sukhwinder Singh and PW-6 LDC Varinder Singh were sufficient to prove the charge against respondent No.1 and his guilt was proved beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt. Still further, it was also apparent that the respondent No.1 was the sole beneficiary of the alleged compromise deed dated 09.04.2005, which was prepared by respondent No.1 on the stamp paper of Rs.15/-, which



was purchased by him from Bhola Nath, Stamp Vendor by forging the signatures of the petitioner.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance, I have gone through the trial Court record carefully.

8. In the present case, both the Courts had rightly held that even from the testimony of PW-1 Dharminder Sachdeva, it was apparent that he had got registered a false case against respondent No.1. He admitted that he had no proof or evidence, from where it could be gathered that the stamp paper had been purchased by respondent No.1. Still further, he also admitted that he was having no proof or evidence to show that his signatures were forged by respondent No.1. Consequently, the complainant while appearing as PW-1, had himself admitted the whole case of the prosecution. Apart from that, the investigation in the present case was also conducted by PW-2 Inspector Bawa Singh, who also admitted that he had not taken the specimen signatures of the petitioner for the purpose of comparison. Consequently, unless the signatures of Dharminder Sachdeva, petitioner were obtained and were sent to the FSL, there was no question of inferring the complicity of respondent No.1 in the crime. Even, PW-4 Bhola Nath Stamp Vendor stated that, he could not identified the person, who had purchased the stamp papers from him. Even, the statements of PW-5 HC Sukhwinder Singh and PW-6 LDC Varinder Singh were of no use. Thus, it is apparent that the prosecution had failed to prove the offence against the respondent No.1 beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt and the petition is ordered to be dismissed.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Case property, if any, be dealt with, as per rules.



11. The Trial Court record be sent back.

21.04.2026
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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