

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

**CRM-24277-2017 IN/AND
CRR No. 1151 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.08.2017**

MANGE RAM

... *Petitioner*

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...*Respondent*

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Garg, AAG, 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)

CRM-24277-2017

The present application has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for early hearing of the criminal revision i.e. CRR-1151-2017.

In view of the averments made in the application, the same is allowed and CRR-1151-2017 is taken on board for hearing today.

Application stands disposed of.

CRR No. 1151 of 2017

Impugned in the present revision petition is the judgement dated 14.02.2017 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mewat affirming the judgment of conviction dated 14.09.2016 and order of sentence dated 15.09.2016 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jhirka vide which the present petitioner was convicted under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay a

fine of ₹ 2000/-, in default thereof to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month.

Custody Certificate dated 26.07.2017 has been filed in the Court today, same is taken on record.

The Courts below has convicted the petitioner under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 for keeping in his possession a country made pistol for which minimum sentence of imprisonment is for one year.

The perusal of the judgments of both the Courts below shows that petitioner has been awarded rigorous imprisonment for one year which is minimum sentence provided for the offence involved in the present case. Therefore, there is no ground for reduction in the sentence awarded to the petitioner.

It being so, there is no illegality or infirmity in the concurrent findings recorded by both the Courts below.

In view of the above, present petition stands dismissed.

August 29, 2017

Suresh Kumar

**[KULDIP SINGH]
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	✓ Yes	/	No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	Yes	/	✓ No