

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

**CRR No.1333 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 12, 2016**

Santokh Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. J.S. Gill, 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)

Learned counsel for the petitioner presses the present revision petition on the point of quantum of sentence only.

It comes out that the allegations against the present petitioner are that he being the Clerk in the complainant-Bank, namely Bank of Baroda siphoned of ₹17,00,000/- by depositing the same in his account. Both the courts below have found that the offence punishable under Section 409 IPC is proved.

Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar sentenced the petitioner to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 2 years and to pay a fine of ₹1,000/-, in default thereof to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for two months. However, in appeal, learned Sessions Judge, Amritsar has reduced the sentence awarded to the petitioner by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar from two years to one year.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for more reduction in the sentence awarded to the petitioner.

I am of the view that sufficient leniency has been shown by the learned Sessions Judge, Amritsar. No further leniency is possible. It is not claimed that the amount has been refunded to the bank.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

April 12, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE