

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

**CRR No.196 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 29, 2016**

Greater Ludhiana Area Development Authority Petitioner

vs.

Dev Raj and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, 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)

CRM-1640-2016

There is delay of 92 days in filing the present revision petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 92 days in filing the present revision petition is condoned.

Application stands disposed of.

Main Case

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the appeal for enhancement of sentence was allowed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana and the amount of fine imposed was enhanced from ₹5,000/- each to ₹10,000/- each.

The limited prayer of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the fine imposed by the lower court may be ordered to be paid to the complainant.

The request of learned counsel for the petitioner is genuine. Accordingly, fine of ₹10,000/- each ordered by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, shall go to the complainant-petitioner.

After going through the file, I do not find any ground to enhance the substantive sentence awarded upon the accused.

The present revision petition is dismissed with the aforesaid modification.

April 29, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE