

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CRA-S-2059-SB-2004
Date of decision: 29.01.2024

Baljit Singh

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Govind Mor, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Challenge in the present appeal is to the judgment/order dated 29.09.2004/30.09.2004, passed by the learned Judge Special Court, Kaithal, whereby the appellant was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months alongwith fine of Rs.1,000/- and in default of payment of the same, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for fifteen days, for the offence punishable under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'the Act').

2. Shorn and short of unnecessary details, the facts culminating in the filing of the present appeal are that on 12.04.2003, when Sub Inspector Dharam Singh alongwith other police officials were on patrolling duty in connection with the checking of miscreants and suspected vehicles, they received secret information and apprehended the accused with a plastic bag carried on his head. After apprising him about his rights, search was conducted in the presence of a Gazetted Officer and recovery of 14 Kgs of poppy husk was effected. The

requisite samples were drawn and sealed. Ruqa was sent on the basis of which an FIR was got registered.

3. After completion of investigation, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented in the Court against the accused. On finding a prima facie case, charges were framed against him, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

4. The prosecution, in order to prove its case, examined as many as 7 witnesses. Thereafter, the statement of the accused was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C., whereby incriminating evidence was put to him, which he denied. He pleaded innocence and false implication. No evidence was led in defence.

5. The trial Court, after appreciating the evidence, came to the conclusion that prosecution has proved its case beyond any reasonable doubt, and accordingly convicted and sentenced the appellant as mentioned in para No.1 above.

6. Aggrieved appellant is before this Court.

7. Learned counsel for the appellant, at the very outset, gives up the challenge to his conviction and prays for reducing the sentence to the period already undergone it being 25 days, on the ground that he is not involved in any other case under this Act; belongs to poor strata of society; sole breadwinner of the family; having one child of marriageable age; recovery was non-commercial; never misused the concession of bail and has been facing the agony of protracted trial for the last 21 years.

8. Learned State counsel opposes the appeal on the ground that the trial Court after evaluating the evidence has rightly convicted the appellant and the sentence awarded to her cannot be said to be excessive, therefore, he prays for

the dismissal of the present appeal. He, however, affirms the fact of the non-involvement of the appellant in any other case under this Act as per the custody certificate dated 17.01.2024 issued by the Deputy Superintendent, District Prison, Kaithal.

9. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the record with their able assistance.

10. Evidently, PW-6 SI Dharam Singh had deposed that the accused-appellant was apprehended and found to be in conscious possession of the alleged contraband, which fact was corroborated by PW-5 DSP Raj Kumar. As per Ex.PL, proved by the Chemical Examiner, contents of contraband were opined to be 'opium'. Link evidence is complete. Thus, there is no scope for interference in the findings recorded therewith and the conclusion arrived at by the trial Court. As such, his conviction is upheld.

11. Insofar as the prayer for reducing the sentence to the period already undergone is concerned, it would be worthwhile to make a reference to the judgment in **S.K. Sakkar @ Mannan vs. State of West Bengal**, (2021) 4 SCC 483, wherein the accused was convicted under Section 20 of the Act and Hon'ble the Supreme Court reduced the sentence of five years to 2 years, 4 months and 16 days, by considering that the occurrence took place in 1997 and he was not a habitual offender, rather a first-time convict.

12. Furthermore, in **Naresh Kumar vs. State of Haryana** in CRA-S-796-SB-2005, decided on 24.02.2023, the sentence of the appellant i.e. 3 years and 6 months, convicted under Section 15 of the Act, was modified to the period undergone i.e. 8 months and 25 days already, by holding that no useful purpose will be served by sending him to jail after 22 years from the date of incident, in

view of the fact that he was only about 28 years old at that time.

13. Humanistically viewing, the appellant having suffered the ignominy of trial since long; successfully warded off his crime-proneness-an evident learning of a lesson; his socio-economic circumstances, this Court finds extenuation to be implicit. Thus, it would serve the ends of justice to reduce his sentence to the period already undergone, however, keeping the fine intact.

14. The order of sentence dated 29/30.09.2004 is modified to the aforesaid extent and as such, the present petition stands partly allowed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

29.01.2024
hemant

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No