

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

**CRR No.795 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 26, 2016**

Krishan Kumar

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 15.12.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sangrur, affirming the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 01.12.2014 passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sunam, vide which the petitioner was convicted under Section 382 IPC and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 30 months and to pay a fine of ₹500/-, in default thereof to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for a period of 15 days.

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

It comes out that as per allegations of the prosecution, on 09.11.2012 at about 3.15 p.m., Labh Singh an elderly man, aged about 78 years had withdrawn ₹3,00,000/- from Punjab National Bank, Branch Sunam. Out of which, he handed over ₹2,50,000/- to his son, namely, Manjit Singh and kept ₹50,000/- with him in the right

pocket of his shirt. Near the main gate of old grain market, Sunam, accused-petitioner confronted him and took out something like weapon from his fold and pointed at him and forcibly snatched ₹50,000/- lying in the right pocket of his shirt. On inquiry, he came to know about the name and address of the accused-petitioner. The accused-petitioner was apprehended on 11.11.2012.

During investigation, the accused made disclosure statement and ₹50,000/- were recovered from him. During the trial, the complainant identified the accused-petitioner.

I am of the view that the judgment of both the courts below are based on sound reasoning and the prosecution story was rightly believed. The incident took place at a busy place in full public view at 3.15 p.m. There are concurrent findings of both the courts below.

Keeping in view the gravity of the offence, there is no scope for reduction in the sentence of imprisonment awarded to the accused-petitioner.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

February 26, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE