

106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 829 of 2016 (O/M)

Date of decision : 10.3.2016

Vikram

..... Revisionist

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate, for the revisionist.

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 of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.4.2015, passed by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda, vide which accused-revisionist was convicted for commission of the offences punishable under Sections 279, 304-A, 337 IPC. He was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 6 months and to pay a fine of Rs. 500/-, in default thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days under Section 279 IPC. He was also sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 2 years and to pay a fine of Rs. 2,000/-, in default thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 1 month under Section 304-A IPC. He was also sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 6 months and to

CRR No. 829 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

pay a fine of Rs. 500/-, in default thereof, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days under Section 337 IPC. All the sentences were directed to run concurrently. Against the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence, the complainant as well as the accused filed an appeal. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, vide judgment dated 3.12.2015, upheld the conviction and reduced the sentence awarded to the accused-revisionist under Section 304-A IPC from rigorous imprisonment of two years to rigorous imprisonment of one year. The accused-revisionist was also directed to pay compensation of Rs. 50,000/- to the complainant within three months.

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

During the course of arguments, the learned counsel for the revisionist has pressed the revision only on the part of quantum of sentence.

The facts and circumstances show that in this case, the accident took place on the over-bridge where the speed of the offending vehicle should have been slow. As a result of the accident, one person, namely, Gurpreet Singh lost his life and his wife Jaswinder Kaur received serious injuries.

In these circumstances, I am of the view that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for one year cannot be called

CRR No. 829 of 2016 (O/M)

excessive or harsh. I have also gone through the judgment of both the Courts below and found these to be well reasoned. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the same. Hence, the present revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

10.3.2016
sjks