

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

**CRM No.24011 of 2018 in/and
CRA-S-72-SB-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : October 05, 2018**

Lachho **..... Appellant**

Versus

State of Punjab **..... Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

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)

Custody certificate of the applicant-appellant filed in the Court today is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the applicant-appellant states that he presses the main appeal only on the point of quantum of sentence.

Therefore, the main case i.e. CRA-S No.72-SB of 2018, which is on the Regular Board of this Court at Sr. No.500, is taken on Board today for hearing.

The applicant-appellant was convicted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 379-B IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 2 years and to pay a fine of Rs.3,000/-, in default thereof to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months by the learned Sessions Judge, Patiala, vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 27.11.2017.

The allegations against the appellant are that she along with two other ladies, namely Babli and Satya boarded an auto rickshaw, in which complainant Urmila was travelling. They forcibly cut the gold bangle of the complainant and fled away. All the three ladies were put to trial. After the trial, two ladies, namely Babli and Satya were acquitted of charges framed against them. However, the applicant-appellant was convicted and sentenced as above.

As per custody certificate, there are so many convictions against the appellant and in many cases, she is facing trial.

Learned counsel for the appellant contends that the applicant-appellant is about 60 years old and she has grand-children. Therefore, a lenient view may be taken. As per custody certificate, the appellant has undergone actual sentence of 10 months, 12 days and total sentence of 1 year, 2 days including remission.

Considering the entirety of the facts and circumstances, the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 2 years awarded to the appellant is reduced to rigorous imprisonment for 1 year, 3 months. However, the remaining part of the sentence is maintained.

With the aforesaid modification, the present appeal is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

October 05, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No