

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

201

Criminal Revision No.1010 of 1986

Date of decision : 22.08.2019

Kartar Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Kulvir Nawal, Advocate for
Mr. Hari Chand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mrs. Sudeepti Sharma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the orders of the trial Court and the Appellate Court, whereby he has been convicted under Sections 326, 324, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one and a half years.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the incident took place in the year 1984, due to sudden quarrel between the first cousins and the injury was caused with a *kassi* (agricultural implement). He also contends that the matter indeed has been compromised and they are residing peacefully. He has also filed affidavits of the petitioner and the complainant in support of the compromise, which are taken on record. The petitioner is a sole bread winner of his family and is not involved in any other case. Learned counsel also contends that the petitioner is not challenging his conviction and would confine his prayer to the reduction in the quantum of sentence to the period already undergone. He also states that petitioner has already undergone sentence of more than two months against sentence of one and a half years.

Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which indicates that the petitioner has undergone sentence of two months and eleven days out of the sentence of one and a half years and is not involved in any other case.

Heard.

It is manifest that the incident had taken place in the year 1984, and the petitioner has already undergone sentence of two months and eleven days out of the sentence of one and a half year. The petitioner is a sole bread winner of his family and is facing criminal proceedings for over three decades. The petitioner is not involved in any other case and the parties have amicably settled their dispute. It would be in the interest of justice if the sentence of the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone. While maintaining his conviction under Sections 326, 324, 34 IPC, the sentence of the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone.

With the above modification, the petition stands disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

August 22, 2019

sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No