

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

553

**CRA-S-796-SB-2005 (O&M)
Decided on : 24.02.2023**

Naresh Kumar

. . . Appellant(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate as *Amicus Curiae*
(appointed vide order dated 04.03.2020).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Appellant – Naresh Kumar, aged about 28 years (at the time of conviction), has filed the present appeal challenging judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 02.12.2004, passed by learned Presiding Officer, Special Court, Kurukshetra, in Sessions Case No.33/2004 of 2002, arising from FIR No. 182, dated 16.04.2002, under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'NDPS Act'), registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, Kurukshetra.

2. On 16.04.2002, ASI Kartar Singh along with other police officials posted in CIA Staff-II, Kurukshetra, on a patrol duty were proceeding in a Govt. Jeep No.HR-07E-1616, driven by C. Jagbir Singh towards village Samani on the GT Road. When they reached near Khalsa Dhaba on GT Road in the area of village Samani, they saw a man was trying to escape from rear door of the said Dhaba, and was briskly proceeding towards the fields behind the Dhaba with a gunny bag on his head. On suspicion, he was apprehended by the police party and notice under Section

50 of the NDPS Act (Ex.PG) was served upon him, and the accused opted to be searched before any gazetted officer. The accused along with said gunny bag was then taken to the residence of Anil Kumar Dhawan, DSP (HQ), Kurukshetra. Thereafter, on the direction of DSP, search of said gunny bag was conducted, which resulted into recovery of poppy husk. After preparing a separate sample of 250 grams of poppy husk, remaining was found to be 38 kilograms including the gunny bag. Thereafter, sample as well as the residue were converted into sealed parcels and taken into possession vide recovery memo Ex.PF, duly attested by witnesses including DSP (HQ), Kurukshetra. Accused was arrested after serving him with arrest memo Ex.PJ and information memo Ex.PH, was also prepared. After completing the investigation and receipt of FSL Report (Ex. PE), seized contraband was declared that of poppy straw. Accordingly, appellant – Naresh Kumar, was put to trial. He was charged for the offence punishable under Section 15 of the NDPS Act, vide order dated 20.08.2002. Eventually, learned Trial Court held the appellant guilty of the offence, vide judgment of conviction dated 02.12.2004 and vide separate order of sentence of even date i.e. order dated 02.12.2004, he was sentenced as under:-

Under Section	Sentence	Fine	In Default
15 of the NDPS Act	3½ years RI	Rs.5,000/-	3 months RI

3. Appeal was admitted on 02.05.2005. Thereafter, vide order dated 16.05.2005, after noticing the factum of total undergone period inside jail, remaining sentence of the appellant was suspended by this Court.

4. At the final hearing of the appeal today, learned counsel for the appellant submits that he has got instructions from his client, not to challenge the judgment of conviction dated 02.12.2004, passed by learned Presiding

Officer, Special Court, Kurukshetra. However, on the question of quantum of sentence, learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant being first offender & sole bread earner for his family; being aged about 47 years at present; there being no other case ever registered against him, except the present one; already 08 months and 25 days of actual sentence period has been undergone by the appellant in jail; and that appellant is facing agony of criminal prosecution for the last about 22 years, by taking a lenient view, remaining substantive sentence of imprisonment of the appellant may be reduced to the period already undergone by him in jail.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, while opposing the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the appellant, submits that prayer of the appellant should not be accepted because he was involved in a serious case, offence of which is a crime against society. Learned State counsel also furnished custody certificate dated 21.02.2023, today in the Court, which is taken on record. As per said custody certificate, appellant has undergone total period of imprisonment of 08 months and 25 days actual sentence, out of total substantive sentence of 3½ years, which was ordered by learned Trial Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance gone through the record.

7. This Court has examined the submissions addressed by learned counsel from both the sides and also perused the custody certificate dated 21.02.2023, and has noticed that except the present case, appellant is not involved in any other criminal case.

8. Another noticeable aspect is that after release of the appellant on bail, vide order dated 16.05.2005, by this Court, he was never found indulged in any other similar activity, which shows that with the passage of time,

appellant has adopted the principles of reformatory theory, which otherwise also sends a direct message to reform oneself despite facing conviction in a criminal case.

9. On the issue of reformatory theory in context to any wrong doer, His Lordship V.R. Krishna Iyer, J., of Hon'ble Apex Court, in case titled as **Mohammad Giasuddin v. State of Andhra Pradesh**, (1977) 3 SCC 287, has observed as under:-

“5. If every saint has a past, every sinner has a future, and it is the role of law to remind both of this. The Indian legal genius of old has made a healthy contribution to the word treasury of criminology. The drawback of our criminal process is that often they are built on the bricks of impressionist opinions and dated values. Ignoring empirical studies and deeper researches.” (emphasis added)

10. In case titled as **Satish @ Sabbe v. State of Uttar Pradesh** (Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 7369 of 2019, decided on 30.09.2020 : Law Finder Doc ID # 1746022), His Lordship Surya Kant, J., says as:

*“Whilst it is undoubtedly true that society has a right to lead a peaceful and fearless life, without free-roaming criminals creating havoc in the lives of ordinary peace-loving citizens. But equally strong is the foundation of reformatory theory which propounds that a civilised society cannot be achieved only through punitive attitudes and vindictiveness; and that instead public harmony, brotherhood and mutual acceptability ought to be fostered. **Thus, first-time offenders ought to be liberally accorded a chance to repent their past and look-forward to a bright future.**” (emphasis added)*

11. This Court also can not ignore the observation made by their Lordships' of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Commissioner of Police and others v. Sandeep Kumar**, (2011) 4 SCC 644:-

“9. The modern approach should be to reform a person instead of branding him as a criminal all his life”.

12. In the case of **Haribhau v. State of Maharashtra**, (2018) 18 SCC 43, Hon'ble Apex Court made observation in the case of an appeal which was preferred against an order of reduction of sentence 'as already undergone'. Para 13 of the said judgment says as under:-

“13. In our considered opinion, firstly, taking into account CRA-S-1962-SB-2004 5 that the appellant has already undergone one month’s jail sentence out of three months awarded to him, secondly, the fact that the incident in question is quite old and seems to have occurred at the spur of the moment, thirdly, the appellant has no criminal antecedent in his past life and lastly, he is not required in any other criminal case except the one in question which the appellant fairly did not deny having committed and rightly did not challenge his conviction, it is considered to be just and proper to alter the jail sentence awarded to the appellant from three months to the extent of period of one month which was already undergone by him and instead enhance the total fine amount awarded under different sections from Rs. 800 to Rs. 15,000/-”

13. Now applying the principles noticed at different stages by the Courts’, I find that recovery of 38 Kgs. of poppy straw in present case, was effected on 16.04.2002, i.e. more than 22 years back; at the time of recovery, appellant was of the age of about 28 years; prior to that he was never found involved in any other case, especially of similar nature; even after involvement of appellant in the present case, there is no other case registered against him; had he been addicted himself or in the business of narcotic drugs, chances of his involvement after registration of the case in hand could be on higher side; non-involvement in any other case is enough to assess that appellant has reformed himself and rehabilitated in the society; and that not sending the appellant again behind the bars, because of not repeating such offence again, may set an example for others also to get inspired of not involving themselves again in the field of narcotic drugs.

Therefore, taking into consideration totality of circumstances, this Court is of the view that ends of justice would be best met, if the substantive sentence of imprisonment of the appellant is reduced to that already undergone by him.

14. Resultantly, conviction of the appellant under Section 15 of the NDPS Act is maintained and his substantive sentence of imprisonment is reduced to that already undergone by him. However, as far as, remaining

part of sentence, i.e. payment of fine of Rs. 5000/- is concerned, same is enhanced from Rs.5000/- to Rs.20,000/-.

15. With the above modification(s) in the order of sentence dated 02.12.2004, passed by learned Presiding Officer, Special Court, Kurukshetra, present **appeal stands disposed of.**

16. Registry is directed to send back original lower court record alongwith a copy of this judgment to learned Trial Court, for taking further steps with regard to the recovery of fine, in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 24, 2023

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No