



sentence already undergone by the appellant, as he has already undergone a period of 04 months and 04 days out of total sentence of 04 years imposed upon him.

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, he does not deserve any leniency.

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 1.750 kilograms of opium, attracting the offence under Section 18 of NDPS Act, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per his custody certificate, he is not involved in any other case and has already undergone a period of 04 months and 04 days out of total sentence of 04 years imposed upon him. 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 18 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 him.

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 like gravity of the offence, manner in which the offence is committed, age of the



CRA-S-713-SB-2008 (O&M)

3

accused, should be considered while determining the quantum of sentence and ther 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 their 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 15.10.2004 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last almost 20 years. Since his conviction, he 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 20.03.2008 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad is upheld.



CRA-S-713-SB-2008 (O&M)

4

(ii) The order of sentence dated 20.03.2008 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 04 years along with fine of Rs. 30,000/- with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

26.05.2025

Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No