

2025:PHHC:052888



S. No.203

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-2954-SB of 2009 (O&M)

Date of Decision:24.04.2025

Nirmal Singh

.....Appellant

Vs.

The State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Ankit Bhinchar, Advocate for
Mr. S.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the appellant.
Mr. Rajiv K. Takkar, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (Oral)

Appellant- Nirmal Singh was tried by Ld. Special Judge, Moga in a case arising out of FIR No.160 dated 2.8.2005 under Section 15 of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station City Dharamkot, as he was found in possession of 30 Kg of poppy straw. After trial, the appellant was convicted under Section 15 of the NDPS Act vide judgment dated 04.12.2009 by the trial Court and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years and to pay fine of ₹2,000/- with default sentence of 03 months rigorous imprisonment in case of non-payment of fine.

2. Against the abovesaid conviction and sentence, this appeal was filed.
3. Today learned counsel for the appellant stated at the outset that appellant do not press the appeal against the judgment of conviction; and that appellant confine his prayer only against order of sentence. It is submitted that appellant would be satisfied, in case he is sentenced to imprisonment for the period already undergone by him.
4. Learned counsel points out that offence pertains to the year 2005; that appellant was of 23 years at that time; that appellant had already undergone



total sentence of 04 months and 26 days and so, he deserve to be sentenced for the period already undergone by him.

5. Learned State Counsel has not seriously objected to the aforesaid prayer.

6. The custody certificate placed on record by the respondent-State would reveal that appellant had already undergone total sentence of 04 months and 26 days. It is revealed further that appellant has no other criminal antecedents. He was of 23 years of age at the time of offence, which had taken place way back in 2005 i.e. 20 years back.

7. 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 him behind bars in the company of hardened criminals.

8. 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 him. As far as fine is concerned, it will remain same.

9. However, it is made clear that amount of fine, if not paid earlier, shall be deposited before learned Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned, within a period of four weeks from today, failing which the appellant will have to carry out the complete sentence as imposed by the trial Court.

Disposed of.

April 24, 2025
renu

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

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