

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

**Criminal Revision No. 4124 of 2015(O&M)
Date of Decision:-11.02.2016**

Makhan Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

1. *Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?*
2. *To be referred to reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present:- Mr. Kamaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

CRM-35567-2015

This is an application under Section 5 of Limitation Act, seeking condonation of delay of 96 days in filing the instant revision petition.

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed and delay of 96 days in filing the instant revision petition, is condoned.

Criminal Revision No. 4124 of 2015

Through the instant revision petition, the petitioner has challenged the judgment dated 06.04.2015 passed by the learned Appellate Court, whereby, learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Bathinda while partly accepting the appeal filed by the accused-appellants (respondents No. 2 to 4 herein), has set aside the order of sentence dated 12.11.2013 passed by the learned trial Court and has modified the order of sentence to the extent that accused-appellants

(respondents No. 2 to 4) have been ordered to be released on probation under Section 4(1) of the Probation of Offenders Act, for a period of one year each after furnishing personal probation bonds in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with the conditions that the accused-respondents No. 2 to 4 will keep and maintain peace and be of good behaviour during the period of one year. Accused-respondents No. 2 to 4 have further been directed to pay total amount of compensation to the tune of Rs.10,000/- each i.e. total Rs. 30,000/- to the complainant-petitioner.

Learned counsel for the complainant-petitioner has contended that taking into consideration the nature of injury caused to the complainant-petitioner, respondents No. 2 to 4 are not entitled for the benefit of probation, as extended by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Bathinda.

Heard.

Since the injured-complainant has suitably been compensated by the accused-respondents No. 2 to 4, as each of the accused was directed to pay a compensation to the tune of Rs.10,000/-, coupled with the fact that the respondents No. 2 to 4 are facing the agony of trial since the year 2010 i.e. the date when FIR No.38, dated 09.10.2010 under Sections 325, 323/34, registered at Police Station, Kotfatta was registered, judgment dated 06.04.2015 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Bathinda, does not warrant any interference of this Court.

Accordingly, the instant revision petition is dismissed.

11.02.2016

Anjal

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE