

107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 713 of 2016 (O/M)

Date of decision : 17.3.2016

Suresh and others

..... Revisionists

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Manoj Kaushik, Advocate, for,
Mr. Ravinder Kaushik, Advocate, for the revisionists.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision is the judgment dated 2.12.2015, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, affirming the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 31.3.2015, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Hansi, vide which the accused-revisionists were convicted for commission of offence punishable under Section 326 read with Section 34 IPC and were sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 3 years each and to pay a fine of Rs. 5,000/- each, in default thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month each.

CRR No. 713 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

Heard.

It comes out that the allegations against the revisionists are that five persons, namely, Hoshiyar Singh, Suresh, Umed, Satish and Udeyghan assaulted complainant Jora Singh when he was sitting with his four years old niece Meenakshi. Accused Satish and Udeyghan caught hold of Jora Singh, whereas Hoshiyar Singh, who was carrying acid glass, tried to pour the same on the face of Jora Singh, but it fell on the left shoulder and chest of Jora Singh. Accused Suresh also tried to pour acid glass on the person of Jora Singh, but the same fell on his niece Meenakshi. Both of them were badly burnt due to acid attack.

Before the lower Court, the complainant stood by his statement. The eye-witness, namely, Pawan Kumar, also supported the prosecution. While relying on the statements of the complainant, eye-witness and the medical evidence, the accused-present revisionists were convicted and sentenced, as aforesaid.

The learned counsel for the revisionists contends that during the investigation, the Station House Officer concerned found that only Hoshiyar Singh was involved in the crime.

However, I am of the view that this evidence of SHO was taken into consideration. The testimonies of complainant and eye-witness were tested before the lower Court and found reliable. The entire evidence was also examined by the first appellate Court. I do

CRR No. 713 of 2016 (O/M)

not find any illegality or infirmity in the same. In this case two persons were badly burnt due to acid attack. Therefore, there is no ground to reduce the sentence also. Hence, the present revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

17.3.2016
sjks