



CRA-S-295-SB-2008 (O&M)

1

**818 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRA-S-295-SB-2008 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.04.2025**

SAROJA

...APPELLANT

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Himanshu Gulati, Advocate,
Mr. Rishav Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG Punjab.

Harpreet Singh Brar, J. (Oral)

1. The prayer in the present appeal is to set aside the judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence dated 24.01.2008 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar, whereby the appellant was convicted and sentenced for the offence punishable under Section 21 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter to be referred as 'NDPS Act') in the case stemming from FIR No. 25 dated 22.02.2003 registered at Police Station Division No.8, Jalandhar.

2. The appellant was convicted for keeping in her possession 110 grams of smack, and sentenced as mentioned below:

Offence under Section	Sentence	Fine	Sentence in default of payment of fine
21 of NDPS Act	Rigorous imprisonment for 01 year	Rs. 1,000/-	Rigorous imprisonment for 02 months

3. Learned Counsel for the appellant submits that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 24.01.2008 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar on merits and restricts his prayer to modification



CRA-S-295-SB-2008 (O&M)

2

of the order on quantum of sentence dated 24.01.2008 to that of sentence already undergone by the appellant as she has already undergone a period of 02 months and 16 days out of total sentence of 01 year imposed upon her.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the appellant on the ground that learned trial Court has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record and as such, the appellant does not deserve any leniency. Moreover, the appellant is also involved in one more case under the NDPS Act. As such, she does not deserve any leniency from this Court.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the appellant was convicted for being in possession of 110 grams of smack, attracting the offence under Section 21 of NDPS Act, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per her custody certificate, she has already undergone an actual sentence of 02 months and 16 days out of total sentence of 01 year, in the instant case. Moreover, learned counsel for the appellant has not assailed the judgment of conviction on merits. Rather, he has restricted his prayer only qua modification of order on quantum of sentence. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section 21 of NDPS Act, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period already undergone by her.

6. 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



CRA-S-295-SB-2008 (O&M)

3

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.

7. 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 said judgment is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, the FIR (supra) was lodged on 22.02.2003 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last more than 22 years. Since her conviction, the appellant has grown into a law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life.

9. Therefore, in view of the discussion above, the present appeal is disposed of in the following terms:-

(i) The judgment dated 24.01.2008 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar is upheld.



CRA-S-295-SB-2008 (O&M)

4

(ii) The order of sentence dated 24.01.2008 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 01 year and fine of Rs. 1,000/- with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by her.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

07.04.2025

Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No