

Revisionist was convicted under Section 16 (i) (a) (i) of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, and was sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one year and to pay fine of Rs. 1,000/-, in default thereof to undergo further simple imprisonment for one month, vide judgment of conviction dated 7.8.2007 and order of sentence dated 8.8.2007, passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rewari. However, in appeal, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari, reduced the substantive sentence from simple imprisonment of one year to simple imprisonment for six months, vide judgment dated 21.2.2014.

CRR No. 742 of 2014 (O/M)

The allegations against revisionist are that he was found in possession of adulterated dal (pulse).

After going through the file, I am of the view that the charges are duly proved. There is no illegality or perversity in the judgments of both the Courts below. Considering that it is adulteration of food item, which carries minimum sentence and that the lower appellate Court has already taken a lenient view, there is no ground for further leniency. Hence, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

28.11.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No