

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Revision No. 3358 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 5.1.2016

Rajinder Kaur

..... Revisionist

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate, for the revisionist.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy A.G. Punjab.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Custody certificate filed in Court today, which is taken on record.

The revisionist was convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar, in case FIR No. 187, dated 11.9.1997, registered under Section 420 IPC at Police Station Jandiala, Amritsar, vide judgment and order dated 25.1.2012. She was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and six months and to pay fine of Rs. 2,000/-, in default thereof, to undergo

Crl. Revision No. 3358 of 2015 (O/M)

-2-

further simple imprisonment for seven days. The fine is stated to have been paid. The appeal filed before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, was dismissed, vide judgment dated 3.8.2015.

In the revision, the notice was issued only qua the quantum of sentence.

I have heard the learned counsel for the revisionist, the learned State counsel and have also carefully gone through the file.

The learned counsel for the revisionist has argued that the revisionist is only 36/37 years of age. She is handicapped and widow lady and has got 12 years old daughter. Therefore, leniency may be shown in the sentence.

The perusal of judgment of the lower Court shows that the revisionist is stated to have duped 13 persons on the promise of getting their sons/daughters employed in Electricity Board, claiming that her relative is serving as higher officer in the Electricity Board.

The learned counsel for the revisionist contends that the revisionist has suffered the agony of protracted trial since year 1997 and keeping in view the background mentioned above, the sentence may be reduced.

After going through the judgments of both the Courts below, I am of the view that in the present case, a large number of villagers have been duped by the revisionist on the pretext of getting

Crl. Revision No. 3358 of 2015 (O/M)

-3-

their sons/daughters employed in the Electricity Board. The maximum sentence in this case is seven years. Therefore, the sentence of one year and six months under Section 420 IPC cannot be called excessive or harsh. The mere protracted trial is no ground to reduce the sentence of the revisionist, which is already on the lower side.

The present revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

5.1.2016
sjks