

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 3415 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 22.9.2017

Rambir Revisionist

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sunny Namdev, 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.

It comes out that present revisionist while driving Eicher tractor without number which was full of bricks hit the motorcycle bearing registration No. HR20G 3346, as a result of which, one of the occupants of motorcycle died and other namely Sandeep received injuries. Complainant, who was present there by chance outside his Tile Factory witnessed the occurrence. Complainant and witness Sandeep while appearing in the witness box supported the prosecution case. The learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Sirsa, vide judgment of conviction dated 20.2.2015, convicted revisionist under Sections 279, 337, 304A IPC and sentenced, vide order of sentence dated 20.2.2015 as under :-

“He is sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months for committing offence under Section 279 IPC; rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months for committing offence under Section 337 IPC; rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years for committing offence under Section 304-A IPC.”

CRR No. 3415 of 2017 (O/M)

All the sentences were directed to run concurrently. In appeal, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, vide judgment dated 17.7.2017, reduced the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for two years awarded under Section 304-A IPC to rigorous imprisonment for one year.

I am of the view that in this case, complainant as well as injured have supported the prosecution case. The complainant is otherwise an independent witness. There is nothing to disbelieve their version. There are concurrent findings of two Courts below. There is no ground to interfere in the judgments of two Courts below. Hence, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

22.9.2017

sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No