

CRR-4139 of 2014 (O&M)

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

CRR-4139 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.11.2017

Ramesh and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: - Mr. Sandeep Goyat, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Through the instant revision petition objection has been raised to the release of respondents No.2 to 6 (in short as 'private respondents') on probation for a period of one year by the First Appellate Court vide judgment dated 08.09.2014 and also directing them to deposit an amount of ₹ 5,000/- each, totalling ₹ 25,000/-, towards compensation to be paid to the petitioners under Section 357 Cr.P.C., affirming the judgment of conviction dated 11.05.2012 and order of sentence dated 16.05.2012 of the trial Court holding the private respondents guilty under Sections 323 and 325 read with section 34 IPC and sentencing them to rigorous imprisonment for three years and to pay a fine of ₹ 3,000/- each.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners, due to the fear of the private respondents, have left their village and are residing at a different place. Private respondents caused six injuries in total

to the petitioners, out of which one was declared grievous, therefore, the compensation granted to the petitioners by the First Appellate Court while

CRR-4139 of 2014 (O&M)

releasing the private respondents on probation is quite on the lower side.

I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

Private respondents were granted probation for one year on their furnishing probation bond in the sum of ₹ 50,000/- with one surety each of the like amount in the year 2014. There is nothing on the record that in the last three years, they ever misused the concession of probation. The compensation of ₹ 25,000/- awarded to the petitioners/injured, considering one grievous injury and five simple injuries in nature, does not seem to be on the lower side.

Since the private respondents have already completed the period of probation without any violation of terms and conditions of the bond, no ground to interfere with the impugned judgment is made out.

Dismissed.

November 14, 2017
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No