

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRR-3731-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-14.1.2020

Satnam Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Satbir Rathore, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court challenging judgment dated 15.10.2018 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur whereby an appeal filed by the petitioner against judgment and order dated 15.10.2016 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Dasuya has been dismissed and conviction of the petitioner for offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 304-A of Indian Penal Code has been upheld.
2. Today, at the very outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he restricts his submissions to the quantum of sentence only and he does not challenge the conviction.
3. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also perused the impugned judgment.
4. Upon perusal of the impugned judgment, this Court does not find any ground for interference in the findings of guilt of the petitioner as recorded by the Trial Court and as affirmed by the learned Appellate Court.

Consequently, the conviction of petitioner is upheld. The Trial Court while holding the petitioner guilty for having committed offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 304-A of Indian Penal Code, imposed the sentence as follows:

Name of the accused	Offence Under Section	Sentence
Satnam Singh	279 IPC	Accused to undergo of 6 months RI and to pay fine of ₹500/-, in default of payment of fine further to undergo sentence for 30 days RI.
	337 IPC	Accused to undergo of 6 months RI and to pay fine of ₹500/-, in default of payment of fine further to undergo sentence for 30 days RI.
	304-A IPC	Accused to undergo of 2 years RI and to pay fine of ₹1,000/-, in default of payment of fine further to undergo sentence for 30 days RI.

5. All the aforesaid sentences were, however, ordered to run concurrently.
6. As per custody certificate filed by learned State counsel today in Court, the petitioner has undergone total sentence of imprisonment of 1 years, 6 months and 19 days including remission to the tune of 4 months and 25 days out of the total imposed sentence of 2 years. He is not stated to be a previous convict. In these circumstances, in my opinion, there could be some room for reduction in sentence. The petition, as such, is accepted to the extent that the substantive sentence of imprisonment as imposed upon the petitioner is reduced from two years to the one already undergone. The fine shall, however, remain unaltered.

7. The revision petition stands accepted to the limited extent as regards modification in sentence as indicated above.

14.1.2020

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No