

CRA-S-1829-SB-2005

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

CRA-S-1829-SB-2005

Date of Decision: 25.03.2015

Mantu

... Appellant (s)

Versus

The State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH

- 1) Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?.
- 2) To be referred to the Reporters or not ?.
- 3) Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Bhag Singh, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

Paramjeet Singh, J.

Present criminal appeal has been preferred by the appellant against judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 22.04.2005 passed by the Special Judge, Ambala whereby appellant has been convicted for the offence punishable under Section 20 (B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of five years and to pay a fine of ₹ 10,000/-, in default, to further undergo imprisonment for six months.

CRA-S-1829-SB-2005

I need not dilate upon the facts of this case in detail as the same have already been recapitulated in the judgment of the learned Court below and in view of the ultimate prayer of the appellant seeking reduction in sentence.

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

Learned counsel for the appellant states that he is not pressing this appeal on merit and is not challenging the conviction on merit. He is only aggrieved against the sentence part. Learned counsel for the appellant prays that the sentence of the appellant be suitably reduced as this criminal trial is hanging on his head like Damocle's sword for more than 11 years and it should be a sufficient mitigating circumstance to treat him leniently. Learned counsel for the appellant has further submitted that FIR relates to the year 2004 and since then a period of more than 11 years has elapsed. The appellant has suffered the ordeal of trial for this long period. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has already undergone imprisonment for more than two years and one month.

In view of the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the appellant, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the appellant behind the bars as the appellant had already faced ordeal for more than 11 years. It is a fit case wherein sentence awarded to the appellant can be reduced to already undergone. Ordered accordingly. The impugned order of sentence and conviction

CRA-S-1829-SB-2005

stands affirmed with aforesaid modification. The appellant is stated to be on bail as his sentence has already been suspended by this Court vide order dated 02.03.2006. However, if the amount of fine is not paid, the appellant will have to undergo default imprisonment for a period of six months as awarded by the trial Court.

With the observations made above, present appeal is disposed of.

25.03.2015
parveen kumar

(Paramjeet Singh)
Judge