

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.4734 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.01.2016

Gurdip Singh and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr.Ashish Sanghi, DAG Punjab

- 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 No.39959-2015

For the reasons mentioned in the application, it is allowed and 93 days delay in filing the revision petition stands condoned.

CRR No.4734 of 2015

Custody certificate filed in Court is taken on record.

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that he does not challenge the conviction of the petitioners and press only for concession in the sentence.

Both the petitioners, namely, Gurdip Singh and Gurbachan Singh along with Parkash Kaur alias Shanti were convicted for the offence punishable under Section 420 IPC and sentenced to Rigorous Imprisonment for two years and fine of Rs.1000/-. In default thereof,

to further undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for one month each by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Batala vide judgment and order dated 4.10.2011. Their appeal was dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur vide judgment dated 5.6.2015.

The perusal of the judgment shows that the allegations against the petitioners are of receiving money for sending the complainant abroad. The money was not returned later on nor steps were taken to send the complainant abroad.

Keeping in view the entirety of facts and circumstances, the sentence of RI under Section 420 IPC is reduced from two years to 1 ½ years. Remaining part of the sentence is kept intact.

With this modification, the revision is dismissed.

21.01.2016
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge