

106 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 2880 of 2017 (O/M)

Date of decision : 24.8.2017

Kuldeep

..... Revisionist

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate, for revisionist.

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)

Heard.

The learned counsel for revisionist contends that the conviction is based only on the statement of one Parveen, whereas Sanjay Singh and his wife Suman were not examined.

The perusal of judgment of both the Courts below shows that accused alongwith two other co-accused attempted to commit the theft from the bag of Sanjay Singh (complainant). Parveen, who is the relative of said Sanjay Singh being the brother in law was also travelling in the same bus. The accused were caught at the spot. The findings of facts have been recorded by both the Courts below. It is the quality and not the quantity, which is to be seen. There is no error in the judgment of the lower Court, convicting and sentencing revisionist under Section 379 IPC read with Section 511 IPC.

Faced with this situation, the learned counsel for revisionist has prayed for leniency in the sentence.

Considering the facts and circumstances, the sentence of simple imprisonment for one year is reduced to simple imprisonment for six months under Section 379 IPC read with Section 511 IPC, while the sentence of fine is maintained.

With the abovenoted modification, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.8.2017

sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	No