



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

203

CRA-S-281-SB-2009

Date of Decision.:03.03.2025

Sunita

.....Appellant

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- None for the appellant.

Mr. Rajeev K. Takkar, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Appellant Sunita was tried by Ld. Special Court, Hoshiarpur in a case arising out of FIR No.178 dated 28.11.2005 under Section 15 of the NDPS Act registered at Police Mahilpur, as she was found in possession of 7.5 Kg of poppy husk. After trial, the appellant was convicted under Section 15 of the NDPS Act vide judgment dated 10.01.2009 by the trial Court and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of ₹5,000/- with default sentence of 01 month in case of non-payment of fine.

2. Against the abovesaid conviction and sentence, this appeal was filed.

3. Today nobody is appearing on behalf of the appellant. This Court has gone through the impugned judgment of the trial Court and finds that conviction has been recorded after proper appreciation of the evidence on record. This Court does not find any reason so as to interfere in the impugned judgment of conviction and as such, the same is hereby maintained.

4. However as far as the impugned order of sentence is

**CRA-S-281-SB-2009****-2-**

concerned it is noticed that appellant was sentenced for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of ₹5,000/- with default sentence of 01 month in case of non-payment of fine for keeping in possession of 7.5 Kg of poppy husk.

5. The custody certificate placed on record by the respondent-State would reveal that appellant has already undergone actual custody sentence of 02 months and 25 days. It is revealed further that she has no criminal antecedents. Although the appellant has not placed on record any affidavit in terms of order dated 24.11.2023 but custody certificate does not indicate that petitioner is involved in any criminal activity after the impugned conviction. She was a woman of 30 years of age at the time of offence, which had taken place way back in 2005 i.e. 20 years back.

6. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it will be in the interest of justice, if the period of imprisonment is reduced to the period already undergone by the appellant, instead of sending her behind bars in the company of hardened criminals.

7. Consequently, the present appeal is partly accepted. By maintaining the impugned judgment against conviction, the order of sentence as passed by the trial Court is modified and the appellant is sentenced to imprisonment for the period already undergone by her.

Disposed of.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

March 03, 2025

Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No