

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

**CRR No.2667 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : September 13, 2017**

Satnam Singh @ Santtu **Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. H.S. Aujla, Advocate for the petitioner.

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)

This is the revision against the judgment dated 18.07.2017 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala, affirming the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.10.2016 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Samana, whereby the present petitioner was convicted and sentenced as under:

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Offence</i>	<i>Imprisonment</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>In default of payment of fine</i>
1	279 IPC	R.I. for 6 months	₹250/-	S.I. for 15 days
2	338 IPC	R.I. for 6 months	₹500/-	S.I. for one month

Both the sentences were directed to run concurrently.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

The allegations against the petitioner are that on 28.09.2013 at about 6.00 p.m., when he was driving a Alto car bearing registration No.PB-10CE-4600 rashly and negligently, he hit three pedestrian, namely, Happy Singh, Kiranjit Singh and Jagtar Singh, resulting in fracture in the right thigh of Happy Singh, fracture in the right leg of Kirandeep Singh and

Jagtar Singh. After the accident, the car hit the motorcycle of Ajaib Singh, complainant, who also fell down. Admittedly, the car was owned by the present petitioner. It is stated in the FIR itself that the wind shield of the car was smashed and the car also got damaged from the right side. The damage of the car was found in the mechanical report. The petitioner is the owner of the car and he did not claim that he had lent his car to anybody. There are concurrent findings of two courts below. There is no ground to interfere in the same.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed to show some leniency in the sentence awarded to the petitioner by the courts below, stating that he is a young man and is the first offender.

Keeping in view the manner, in which the accident took place and the injuries i.e. fractures of legs of three persons, I do not find any ground to show any leniency in the sentence awarded to the petitioner.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

September 13, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No