

211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 3496 of 2014 (O/M)

Date of decision : 29.3.2016

Inderjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy A.G. Punjab.  
Mr. Vinod Bhardwaj, for respondents No. 2 to 4.

-:-

-:-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Learned State counsel states that the matter can be decided on the basis of documents already available on file.

The arguments in the main revision heard.

Petitioner-Inderjit Singh has been convicted for commission of offences punishable under Sections 279, 338 and 304-A IPC and was sentenced to undergo maximum rigorous imprisonment for two years by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Kharar, vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 2.8.2013. The appeal filed by the present petitioner before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali), was dismissed, vide judgment dated 17.9.2014. This is how the petitioner has come up to this Court by way of present revision.

It comes out that in this case one Kanchan had died,

CRR No. 3496 of 2014 (O/M)

whereas one Rajni was injured. The petitioner amended the Memo of Parties and the parents of deceased Kanchan have been made parties alongwith Rajni injured.

The learned counsel for the injured Rajni and parents of the deceased Kanchan has put in appearance.

The compromise has been filed before this Court, in which it is stated that now the parties have effected a compromise.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that on account of compromise between the parties, rupees one lac have been paid to the parents of deceased Kanchan. Therefore, injured Rajni as well as parents of the deceased have no objection, if some leniency is shown.

Keeping in view the fact that the legal heirs of the deceased Kanchan as well as injured Rajni have effected compromise with the accused, the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for two years passed under Sections 338 and 304-A IPC is reduced to rigorous imprisonment for one year on each count. The remaining part of the sentence passed under the said sections and under Section 279 IPC is maintained.

With the abovenoted modification, the present revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE

29.3.2016  
sjks