

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

CRR No.2755 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of decision : July 03, 2017

Sukhjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.R. Singla, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

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)

The present revisionist was convicted by the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dabwali, vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 15.01.2010 under Sections 324, 326, 342 and 506 IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years for commission of offence punishable under Section 324 IPC. He was further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years for the commission of offence punishable under Section 326 IPC and further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months for the commission of offence punishable under Section 342 IPC. All the sentences were ordered to run concurrently. However, in appeal, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, vide judgment dated 11.08.2012 reduced the sentence of the revisionist from rigorous imprisonment of three years to 1-1/2 years for the commission of the offence punishable under Section 326 IPC while directing him to deposit a sum of ₹30,000/- as compensation to be paid to the complainant Sukhminder Singh @ Pappu S/o Kapur Singh. However,

the remaining part of the sentence was maintained.

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the revisionist in the Court today and the same is taken on record. It shows that the revisionist has undergone actual sentence of one year, one month and 21 days and with remission he has undergone one year, two months and four days.

The short prayer made by the learned counsel for the revisionist is that keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the sentence of the revisionist may be reduced to the period already undergone by him.

After considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the plea of learned counsel for the revisionist is accepted. The sentence awarded to the revisionist for the commission of offence punishable under Section 326 IPC is reduced to the period already undergone by him. The revisionist Sukhjit Singh be released forthwith on depositing the amount of compensation i.e. ₹30,000/- as ordered by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sirsa, if already not deposited.

With the aforesaid modification, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

July 03, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No