

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No.651 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: March 22, 2016

Piara Singh and another

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGHPresent: Mr.Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate
for the petitioners.Ms.Shivali, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

The present revision has been filed by the petitioners Piara Singh and Paramjit Kaur against State of Punjab, challenging the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 19.08.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar, vide which the petitioners were convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years and to pay fine of ₹500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of five days under Section 326 read with Section 34 IPC and further to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of ₹500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of five days under Section 324 read with Section 34 IPC and also to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three months under

Section 323 read with Section 34 IPC and also challenging the judgment dated 04.02.2016 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Amrtisar, vide which appeal filed by petitioner was partly allowed and petitioners were acquitted of the charge under Section 326 read with Section 34 IPC but the remaining conviction and sentences were confirmed.

At the time of preliminary hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner did not dispute the concurrent findings of the Courts below regarding conviction and contended only on the point of reduction of sentence. Notice of motion was issued only qua quantum of sentence. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners contended that petitioners are first offenders, poor person and they are suffering from criminal proceedings since 2011.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the perusal of the record as well as from the arguments, it is clear that 36 injuries were attributed to the petitioners with the sharp edged weapon.

Keeping in view the nature and number of injuries, I do not find any ground to reduce the sentence of the petitioners.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present revision petition, the same is dismissed.

March 22, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE