

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

**Criminal Revision No.1947 of 2012 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.03.2016**

Teja Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Bikkar Singh & others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

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

Present:- Mr. A.S. Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. G.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondents no.1 to 4.

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Petitioner-complainant has filed the present revision petition against judgment dated 8.2.2012 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Mansa, whereby though the appeal preferred by the accused-respondents against the judgment of conviction dated 24.10.2011 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate,

Mansa has been dismissed, however, the sentence imposed upon them has been modified and they have been directed to be released on probation on their executing the bonds of good conduct in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety of like amount each, to the satisfaction of that Court, for one year. The operative part of the aforesaid judgment reads as under:-

“13. I have gone through the record of the case. As per the police report appellants-accused are the first offender. They have small children and old parents to look after. They are the only bread earners in their families. They are attending the Court in this case for the last about five years. So, keeping in view these facts, I am of the view that one chance should be given to appellants-accused to mend themselves and to become law abiding citizens. Therefore, the sentence of imprisonment awarded to appellants-accused by the learned lower Court is modified and they are directed to be released on probation on their executing the bonds of good conduct in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety of the like amount, each, to the satisfaction of this Court for a period of one year and in the meantime to keep peace and be of good behaviour, with the direction that they shall come to the Court as and when called by this Court to undergo the remaining period of sentence. The amount of fine, if any, deposited by the accused in the lower Court, shall be treated as litigation expenses. With this modification in the sentence portion by ordering the release of appellants-accused on probation of good conduct, the appeal is dismissed. Lower Court record be sent back. Appeal files be consigned to the record room.”

On 29.1.2013, while issuing notice of motion only on the point of awarding compensation, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Contends that petitioner-complainant had sustained grievous injury and also spent money in getting the same treated and however, no compensation has been awarded by learned Sessions Judge, Mansa to him while releasing respondents-accused on probation.

Notice of motion only on the point of awarding compensation to petitioner-complainant for 08.04.2013.

Learned counsel for the respondents no.1 to 4 states that in terms of interim order dated 29.1.2013, respondents no.1 to 4 are ready to compensate the petitioner and accordingly, they will make payment of Rs.50,000/- to the petitioner within 1½ month from today.

In view of the statement made on behalf of respondents no.1 to 4, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this revision petition.

Dismissed as not pressed.

March 10, 2016
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE