



CRR-923-2023 (O&M) -1-

(256) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRR-923-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.08.2026

HARJEET SINGH ... Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Diwan S. Adlakha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The present revision petition has been filed against the impugned judgment dated 18.10.2022 passed by the Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar, whereby while upholding the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 03.05.2017 passed by the JMIC, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri, ordered the release of respondent Nos.2 to 4 on probation.

2. The brief facts of the case are that three persons namely, Balkar Singh (respondent No.2), Kulbir Singh (respondent No.3) and Arun Bakshi (respondent No.4) were convicted in FIR No.40 dated 06.02.2013 and sentenced as under:-

Name of accused	Offence	Rigorous imprisonment
Balkar Singh	427 IPC r/w 34 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for 06 months
	506 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for 06 months



Kulbir Singh	427 IPC r/w 34 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for 06 months
	506 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for 06 months
Arun Bakshi	427 IPC r/w 34 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for 06 months
	506 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for 06 months

Both the sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

3. The appeal filed by the aforesaid accused was partly allowed. The judgment of conviction dated 03.05.2017 under Sections 427 and 506 of the IPC was maintained. However, the sentence was modified. Instead of immediate imprisonment, respondent Nos. 2 to 4 were ordered to be released on probation under Section 4 of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958, read with Section 360 Cr.P.C., upon their furnishing bonds in the sum of ₹50,000/- each, with one surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, for a period of one year. During the said period, respondent Nos. 2 to 4 were required to maintain peace and good behaviour and to appear before the Court to receive sentence as and when called upon to do so.

In addition, respondent Nos.2 to 4 were directed to deposit a sum of ₹25,000/- each as compensation (with the Trial Magistrate) to be paid to the petitioner/complainant for damaging his car and house. If the respondent Nos.2 to 4 failed to pay compensation and furnish the requisite bonds within 15 days from the date of this order, the appeal would stand dismissed and they

**CRR-923-2023 (O&M)**

-3-

would undergo the sentence awarded by the Magistrate under Sections 427 & 506 IPC.

4. Against the aforementioned judgments, the complainant-Harjeet Singh (petitioner) preferred this revision petition challenging the granting of probation to respondent Nos.2 to 4 and seeking enhancement of sentence including sentence of imprisonment to be awarded.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner-complainant contends that the Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar has wrongly released the accused-respondent Nos.2 to 4 on probation despite the fact that on 05.02.2013 at about 3.15 PM, all the accused-respondent Nos.2 to 4 in furtherance of their common intention voluntarily caused simple hurt to the complainant. Therefore, their sentence ought to be enhanced from the grant of probation to the awarding of sentence of imprisonment.

6. The learned counsel for the State has supported the case of the petitioner contending that the sentence of respondent Nos.2 to 4 be enhanced from grant of probation to the awarding of sentence of imprisonment.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at length.

8. This Court in **Rajinder Singh Versus State of Haryana & others** **passed in CRM-M-249-2013 dated 27.08.2018**, held as under:-

“The judgment of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal is dated 27.10.2012, thus, respondent No.2 and 3 have already undergone sentence of probation imposed upon them and, therefore, no reason arises for me to go into the legality or propriety of the impugned judgment.



CRR-923-2023 (O&M)

-4-

The present petition stands disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.”

9. In the present case, the judgment of the learned Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar is dated 18.10.2022 and therefore, the respondent Nos.2 to 4 have already undergone the sentence of probation imposed upon them. Therefore, there is no requirement for this Court to go into the legality or propriety of the impugned judgment.

10. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

12.08.2026
JITESH

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