

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

CRA-S-1651-SB-2005

Date of decision : March 10, 2016

Inder @ Nikka

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURMIT RAM

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not? No / Yes
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? No / Yes

Present : Mr. Jatinder Nagpal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Deepak Garg, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

GURMIT RAM, J.

1. This appeal is preferred by the abovesaid appellant-Inder @ Nikka against the judgment and order of sentence dated 29.07.2005 passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar in criminal case bearing FIR No.386 dated 13.09.2003, Police Station Sadar, Jalandhar under Sections 307, 454, 380, 452, 511, 324, 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code ("IPC"- for short), vide which he (appellant) was held guilty for the offences punishable under Sections 393 and 394, IPC and

awarded sentences as detailed below:-

393, IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years and to pay fine of ₹500/-.	In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month.
394, IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for five years and to pay fine of ₹500/-.	In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month.

Being not satisfied with the abovesaid impugned judgment and order of sentence, the appellant has come up before this Court by way of instant appeal.

2. At the time of arguments, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate in respect of appellant (convict)-Inder @ Nikka in the shape of affidavit of Sh.Lalit Kohli, PPS, Deputy Superintendent Central Jail, Jalandhar at Kapurthala, copy of which has been supplied to learned counsel for the appellant.

3. As per the custody certificate, the appellant was released from jail in this case on 14.09.2006 after completion of his sentence which includes actual sentence of two years, eleven months and remission of two years and one month.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that since the appellant has already undergone his sentence of imprisonment in this case and has been released from jail, so this appeal may be disposed of in

accordance thereto as having been rendered infructuous.

5. In view of the above, this appeal stands dismissed as having been rendered infructuous and disposed of accordingly.

March 10, 2016

Gaurav Sorot

**(GURMIT RAM)
JUDGE**