

CRA-S-820-SB-2007 (O&M)

504

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-820-SB-2007 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.03.2025

1

SOHAN LAL @ SONU

...APPELLANT

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Harkesh Kumar, AAG Haryana.

Harpreet Singh Brar, J. (Oral)

1. Present appeal has been preferred by the appellant against the judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence dated 21.12.2006 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar vide which the appellant has been convicted and sentenced as mentioned below:

Offence under Section	Sentence	Fine	Sentence in default of payment of fine
15 of NDPS Act	Rigorous imprisonment for three years	Rs. 2,000/-	Rigorous imprisonment for one month

2. Briefly stated the facts of the prosecution case are that on 12.09.2004 SI Mahtab Singh along with other police officials were present at Plate Form No. 3, near Railway Bridge, Hisar in connection with patrolling and checking of suspicious persons. In the meantime, train No. 4HS came from Sadulpur side and stopped at Plate Form No. 3 and a person came towards Railway Bridge after alighting from the train while carrying a bag in his right hand. After seeing the police party, that person became nervous and tried to turn back, who was apprehended by SI Mahtab Singh with the help of other police officials on the basis of suspicion and upon asking, he disclosed his name as

**CRA-S-820-SB-2007 (O&M)****2**

Sohan Lal @ Sonu son of Prem Nand. On suspicion, search of the accused-appellant and his belongings was conducted and on checking the bag, held by appellant, poppy straw was found. Two samples each weighing 100 grams were separated from the bulk and the remaining poppy straw upon weighment came to be 4.600 KG. Separate parcels of the samples as well as remaining bulk of the poppy straw were prepared, which were sealed. FIR(*supra*) was registered under Sections 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter to be referred as 'NDPS Act').

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 21.12.2006 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar on merits and restricts his prayer to modification of the order on quantum of sentence dated 21.12.2006 to that of sentence already undergone by the appellant as he has already undergone a period of more than 01 year 02 months out of total sentence of three years imposed upon him and he is not involved in any other case.

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.

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 4.800 kilogram of poppy straw, attracting the offence under Section 15 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 an actual sentence of 01 year 02 months and 20 days out of total sentence of three years, in the instant case. Moreover, learned

**CRA-S-820-SB-2007 (O&M)****3**

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 15 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 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

**CRA-S-820-SB-2007 (O&M)****4**

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 12.09.2004 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last more than 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 21.12.2006 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar is upheld.

(ii) The order of sentence dated 21.12.2006 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for three years along with fine of Rs. 2,000/- 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

18.03.2025*Ajay Goswami**Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**Yes/No
Yes/No*