

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

Criminal Revision No. 2163 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 10, 2017

Vikram Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arvind Singh Sangwan

Present: Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Arun Kumar, Assistant Advocate
General, Haryana.

Arvind Singh Sangwan, J.

Petitioner-Vikram Singh had faced trial in FIR No.184 dated 10.8.2007 qua commission of an offence under Section 392 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 ('the Act') registered at Police Station Pundri. The trial Court vide judgment/order dated 1.6.2012/4.6.2012 convicted and sentenced the petitioner for commission of offence punishable under Section 392 IPC and Section 25 of the Act. The appeal filed against the said judgment/order passed by the trial Court was partly allowed qua the offence under Section 25 of the Act and appellant

was punished with rigorous imprisonment for two years under Section 392 IPC by the appellate Court vide order dated 6.6.2014. Hence, the present revision petition by the accused-petitioner-Vikram Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, during the course of arguments, has not challenged the conviction of the petitioner under Section 392 IPC but has submitted that the sentence qua imprisonment be reduced to already undergone by the petitioner. Fine, as imposed by the trial Court, has since been deposited by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is the sole bread earner of the family and has remained in custody for more than 11 months and has been facing the trial since 10.8.2007. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner has not misused the concession of bail when he was on bail during trial as well as in appeal.

Learned counsel for the State has not disputed the actual sentence undergone by the petitioner as well as the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, it would be just and expedient to reduce the sentence qua imprisonment of the petitioner to already undergone by him.

Considering the fact that the petitioner has already faced the agony of long litigation for the last more than 10 years and

has not misused the concession of bail and also in view of the fact that he is not habitual offender, accordingly, the conviction of the petitioner under Section 392 IPC is maintained. However, the sentence qua imprisonment of the petitioner is reduced to already undergone by him.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(Arvind Singh Sangwan)
Judge

August 10, 2017

arya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No