



577

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-1404-2010
Date of decision: 08.11.2024

HARJINDER SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. G.S. Kaura, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Rishav Jain, Advocate with
Ms. Shivaly Singla, Advocate for the complainant.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This revision has been preferred against the judgment dated 10.04.2010 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Barnala, vide which, judgment of conviction and order of quantum of sentence dated 30.05.2006 passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barnala in case bearing FIR No.20 dated 10.03.2004 registered under Sections 452/354/506 IPC at Police Station Bhadaur have been upheld.
2. The petitioner was sentenced as under:

Offence	Sentence
452 IPC	RI for 02 and half years with a fine of Rs.1,000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 30 days
354 IPC	RI for 01 and half year
506 IPC	RI for 06 months
All the sentences shall run consecutively.	

3. Briefly, the facts of the prosecution story are that on 10.03.2004, the complainant state that petitioner entered into her house, when she and her son were alone in the house. Thereafter, the petitioner caught hold of the breast of the complainant and started teasing her. The complainant asked her son to call his father and during the scuffle between the petitioner and the



complainant, her shirt was also torn. In the meanwhile, husband of the complainant accompanied by her son came in the house and the petitioner ran away from the spot by threatening that in case, they reported the matter to anyone, he would kill them. Then they called her mother-in-law and father-in-law and apprised them from occurrence. Hence the complaint.

4. The petitioner was convicted vide judgment dated 30.05.2006 by the learned trial Court, which has also been upheld by lower Appellate Court vide judgment dated 10.04.2010.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 30.05.2006 on merits and restricts his prayer to modification of the order of quantum of sentence to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioner. Petitioner has undergone a total period of 01 month and 25 days and is not involved in any other case.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer of the petitioner as the learned trial Court has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record, which has also been upheld by the learned lower Appellate Court and as such, he does not deserve any leniency.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

8. In ***Deo Narain Mandal v. State of UP (2004) 7 SCC 257***, a Three Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has opined that awarding of sentence is not a mere formality in criminal cases. When a minimum and maximum term is prescribed by the statute with regard to the period of sentence, a discretionary element is vested in the Court. Background of each



case, which includes factors like gravity of the offence, manner in which the offence is committed, age of the accused, should be considered while determining the quantum of sentence and this discretion is not to be used arbitrarily or whimsically. After assessing all relevant factors, proper sentence should be awarded bearing in mind the principle of proportionality to ensure the sentence is neither excessively harsh nor does it come across as lenient. Further, a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ravada Sasikala v. State of AP AIR 2017 SC 1166***, has reiterated that the imposition of sentence also serves a social purpose as it acts as a deterrent by making the accused realise the damage caused not only to the victim but also to the society at large. The law in this regard is well settled that opportunities of reformation must be granted and such discretion is to be exercised by evaluating all attending circumstances of each case by noticing the nature of the crime, the manner in which the crime was committed and the conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

9. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the learned trial Court indicates no perversity in its findings and the same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioner has not assailed the judgment of conviction on merits, rather he has restricted his prayer only qua modification of quantum of sentence.

10. The FIR in the present case was lodged on 10.03.2004 and the petitioner has been suffering the agony of protracted trial for last more than 20 years. At the time of the conviction of the petitioner, the maximum sentence under Section 354 IPC was up to 02 years and the amendment was carried out in the year 2013. Therefore, in the case of the petitioner, minimum sentence



was not prescribed. Since his conviction, the petitioner has grown into law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life. As per his custody certificate, he is not involved in any other case and has undergone a period of more than 01 month out of total sentence of 02 and half years, in the instant case.

11. Accordingly, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

12. Consequently, the present petition is disposed of in the following terms:-

- (i) The judgment dated 10.04.2010 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Barnala, affirming the judgment of conviction is upheld, however, the order of sentence dated 30.05.2006 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 02 and half years along with default mechanism awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him subject to the fine of an amount of Rs.10,000/- upon the petitioner.
- (ii) The petitioner is directed to deposit the amount of fine in the trial Court within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case of default of payment of fine, the petitioner shall be liable to be taken into custody and made to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month.

November 08, 2024
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No