

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

254

**CRR No. 1146 of 2016
Date of decision: 17.01.2018**

BADAL RAM AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Vs.

DALBIR SINGH AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present: Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate as Legal Aid counsel
for the petitioners assisted by Mr. Rahul Vats, Advocate.

H.S. MADAAN, J.(ORAL)

Dharam Raj, Badal Ram and Hanuman Parshad accused faced trial by Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Bhiwani in FIR No. 89 dated 28.05.2008 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 325, 506/34 IPC registered at Police Station Bhiwani Khera and vide judgement dated 04.04.2014 they were acquitted of the charge framed against them.

On an appeal having been filed by complainant, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani vide judgment dated 12.12.2015, set aside the judgment passed by the Trial Court and convicted Dharam Raj, Badal Ram and Hanuman Parshad for offence punishable under Section 323 read with Section 34 IPC. However, they were ordered to be released on probation subject to their furnishing probation bonds for a sum of ₹ 50,000/- with one surety in the like amount and pay ₹15,000/- each as compensation to the complainant-injured under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C. observing that in case compensation amount was not paid within the prescribed period of one month from the date of judgment of Appellate Court then they

would have to undergo 6 months simple imprisonment each. The accused/convicts were directed to keep peace, be of good behaviour and will not indulge in any illegal activities during the period of next one year. The accused are stated to have furnished requisite bonds and deposited the compensation within the stipulated period. Hanuman Parshad accused is said to have expired, as stated by learned counsel representing the petitioners.

Feeling aggrieved by judgment passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani. The accused/convicts have filed the present revision petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the records. I find that impugned judgment is well reasoned one and there is no illegality or infirmity appearing on the face of the judgment which might have called for interference by this Court while exercising the revisional powers. The petition is dismissed accordingly.

January 17, 2018
Poonam (II)

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes

Whether reportable:

No