

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**CRR No. 2611 of 2014 (O&M)**  
**Date of Decision : 05.05.2015**

Jagtar Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. NAGRATH**

- 1. *Whether Reporters of 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. P.P.S. Duggal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gazi Mohd., AAG, Punjab.

**R.P. Nagrath, J. (Oral)**

The instant revision has been filed by the petitioner against the concurrent findings of his conviction recorded by the courts under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). The trial Court awarded him the sentence to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years and to pay fine of ₹ 1000/-, in default of payment of fine to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days. The sentence awarded by the trial Court has also been upheld by the appellate Court while dismissing the appeal.

The prosecution story was also supported by son of the complainant examined as PW-4 in respect of whom the petitioner is alleged to have obtained money with the assurance to get him employed in the forest department as a clerk.

When the matter was listed on 21.01.2015, learned counsel for the petitioner did not challenge the conviction on merits and confined his prayer only qua the quantum of sentence.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the State counsel, perused the judgments of both the courts below and the paper-book.

The complainant is stated to have been defrauded for an amount of ₹ 82,000/- in the year 2001. FIR was registered in the month of March 2005.

As per custody certificate placed on record by learned State counsel, the petitioner has undergone more than 11 months of actual imprisonment and with remissions about 1 years and 2 months of imprisonment out of the total sentence of 2 years of imprisonment.

Looking into the facts of the case especially the amount involved, I deem it appropriate to reduce the substantive sentence to the period already undergone.

In view of the above, the instant revision is partly allowed by reducing the sentence of imprisonment from two years of rigorous imprisonment to the period already undergone and maintaining the imposition of fine with the default clause but dismissed on merits.

**May 05, 2015**  
jk

**( R.P. NAGRATH )**  
**JUDGE**