

required to pay the loan amount in 47 monthly installments of Rs.9095/- each along with agreed interest and also other charges of the complainant company.

In order to discharge his liability, he issued a cheque in favour of the complainant company, worth Rs.3,71,990/- relating to Hisar Sirsa Kshetria Gramin Bank, Amritsar Kalan Branch, District Sirsa, bearing No.618983 dated 21.05.2008 out of his account No.2063 with the said bank. But when the said cheque was sent in the said bank for collection the same was dishonoured on account 'INSUFFICIENT FUNDS', in respect of which, the present complaint has been filed by the complainant after issuance of legal notice to the petitioner.

3. The petitioner was convicted vide judgement dated 23.02.2013 passed by the learned trial Court, which has also been upheld by lower Appellate Court vide judgment dated 07.10.2015.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 23.02.2013 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, as he has already undergone a period of 03 months and 25 days and is not involved in any other criminal activity.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel 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 Appellant Court and as such, he does not deserve any leniency.

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

7. In ***Deo Narain Mandal v. State 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.

8. 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 quantum of sentence.

9. The complaint in the present case was lodged on 31.07.2008 and the petitioner has been suffering the agony of protracted trial for more than last

15 years. Since his conviction, the petitioner has grown into a 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 actual sentence of 03 months and 10 days, out of total sentence of 06 months, in the instant case.

10. 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.

11. Consequently, the present appeal is disposed of in the following terms:-

(i) The judgment dated 07.10.2015 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa affirming the judgment of conviction is upheld, however, the order of sentence dated 27.02.2013 is modified to the extent that the sentence of simple imprisonment for 06 months along with default mechanism awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

(ii) The sentence qua payment of compensation shall remain intact and the respondent No.2-complainant will be at liberty to recover the same in accordance with law.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

March 20, 2024
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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