

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

**CRR No.227 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: May 10, 2016**

Ranjit Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Parvez Chugh, 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-1971-2016

There is delay of 67 days in filing the present revision petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 101 days in filing the present revision petition is condoned, subject to all just exception.

Application stands disposed of.

Main case

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

The perusal of the judgment of the lower Court shows that in this case, three persons, namely, Kaka Singh, Kulwinder Singh and Ranjit Singh were convicted for commission of offences punishable under Sections 382 and 411 IPC, vide judgment

of conviction and order of sentence dated 22.2.2013, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Sri Muktsar Sahib. They were sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years each and to pay a fine of ₹500/- each, in default thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month each under Section 382 IPC. They were also sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year each and to pay a fine of ₹250/- each, in default thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days each under Section 411 IPC. All the sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

The perusal of the judgment of the lower Court shows that the allegations against the accused are of snatching of one gold ring, mobile phone and ₹500/- cash. The appeal filed by the accused/appellant was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, vide judgment dated 22.9.2015.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances and the alleged recovery, there is some scope for reduction in the sentence.

Therefore, the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for two years, passed under Section 382 IPC, is reduced from 2 years to 1 ½ years. The remaining part of the sentence under Section 382 IPC is maintained. The sentence passed under Section 411 IPC is also maintained.

With abovesaid modification, the present revision is dismissed.

May 10, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE