

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

CRR No.237 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 21, 2016

Ajay Kumar and another **Petitioners**

VS.

State of Punjab Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Navdeep Chhabra, Advocate for the petitioners.

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)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the judgment dated 05.11.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, affirming the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 06.05.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Sri Muktsar Sahib, vide which the accused-petitioners were convicted and sentenced as under:

<i>Name of the accused</i>	<i>Offence u/s</i>	<i>Sentence (R.I.)</i>	<i>Fine (₹)</i>	<i>In default of payment of fine</i>
Ajay Kumar	457 IPC	2 years	500/-	R.I. for 15 days
	380/511 IPC	6 months	1000/-	R.I. for 1 month
	427 IPC	6 months	--	--
Akash Kumar	457 IPC	2 years	500/-	R.I. for 15 days
	380/511 IPC	6 months	1000/-	R.I. for 1 month
	427 IPC	6 months	--	--

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have also carefully gone through the case file.

A perusal of judgments of both the courts below shows that when the present petitioners had vandalized the ATM. The same

was recorded in the CCTV camera fixed in the ATM cabin. The same was proved before the trial court. Both the courts below have relied upon the CCTV footage of the ATM cabin, which proved that the present accused-petitioners are the same persons, who had vandalized the ATM. There are concurrent findings of both the courts below. Thus, there is no ground to interfere in the same.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

January 21, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE