



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-933-2024 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 16.09.2024

MOHAMMAD DILSHAD @ MEHMOOD MODI
.....APPELLANT
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Avtar Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

CRM-10441-2024

Prayer in the present application is for suspension of sentence of the applicant/appellant during the pendency of present appeal.

Learned counsel for the applicant/appellant submits that he does not want to press the present application. However, he prays for listing the main appeal for final hearing.

Prayer is accepted.

The present application is dismissed being not pressed. However, the main appeal is ordered to be taken up for final hearing on today itself.

CRA-S-933-2024 (O&M)

1. With the consent of learned counsel for the respective parties, the main appeal is taken on board for final hearing.
2. The instant appeal has been preferred by the appellant namely



Mohammad Dilshad @ Mehmood Modi, challenging the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 25.01.2024 passed by Judge, Special Court, Barnala whereby he has been convicted for commission of offence under Section 22 of NDPS Act and has been sentenced to undergo RI for a period of three years along with fine to the tune of Rs.25,000/- and in default thereof, to further undergo RI for one month.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the appellant contends that he does not want to challenge the conviction of the appellant on merits. However, he submits that in view of the circumstances of the case, the sentence awarded by the trial Court is on higher side.

4. Here it would be pertinent to mention that the appellant does not challenge his conviction on merits and only confined his relief qua quantum of sentence. This Court has also scrutinized the impugned judgment as well as the relevant documents/evidence and is of the considered view that there is no scope for any interference in impugned judgment as far as the conviction of the appellant is concerned. As such, the conviction of the appellant is upheld.

5. As far as quantum of sentence is concerned, there are mitigating circumstances to take a lenient view in the matter of sentence awarded by the trial court. Apart from the fact that the appellant has already faced the agony of protracted trial for sufficient time, he is a sole bread earner of family. The appellant has already undergone the actual sentence for a period of 9 months and 28 days as of now, out of total substantive sentence of three years. Thus, this court is of the considered view that a chance be given to the appellant to reform & improve himself; to become a good citizen; and to lead a peaceful & harmonious life.



6. Taking into consideration the above narrated discussion as well as the fact that the appellant has not challenged his conviction on merits, while affirming his conviction, the order of sentence is modified to the extent to the period already undergone by him with no change in fine clause.
7. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, the present appeal stands disposed off.
8. The appellant is ordered to be released forthwith in case he is not required in any other case.
9. Pending criminal misc. application, if any shall also disposed off.

16.09.2024
sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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