

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.2355 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.02.2016

Sukhwinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

versus

Shindo and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Satwant Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

The petitioner, who is complainant, has challenged the judgment dated 9.3.2015, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide which, in a complaint case, in which accused were convicted under Sections 323, 452, 506 read with section 149 IPC by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 5.12.2013, while maintaining the conviction of the accused, they were ordered to be released on probation. A compensation of Rs.5000/- was also awarded to the complainant. Litigation cost of Rs.1500/- was also imposed upon the accused.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the file.

Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that at the first instance, the order granting the probation is illegal in view of the fact that after committing the tress-pass, the simple injuries were caused and secondly, compensation is inadequate.

I am of the view that accused were the first offenders. Injuries were simple in nature. Therefore, there is nothing illegal in granting the benefit of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958 to the accused. Keeping in view the nature of injuries, compensation of Rs.5000/- is also adequate.

No ground to interfere.

The revision petition stands dismissed.

26.02.2016
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge