

203

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-2828-SB-2010 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.03.2025

Satish Rani

....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Dushant Jog, Advocate for
Mr. H.S. Saini, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer in the present appeal is to set aside the judgment of conviction dated 04.11.2010 and order of sentence dated 08.11.2010 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Karnal, whereby, the appellant was convicted and sentenced for the offence punishable under Section 18 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter ‘NDPS Act’), in the case stemming from FIR No.556 dated 05.09.2007, under Section 18 of the NDPS Act and Section 420 of IPC at Police Station City Karnal.

2. The appellant was convicted for keeping in possession 50 grams of opium and was sentenced as mentioned below:

Offence	Sentence
Section 18 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay fine of Rs.1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 04.11.2010 on merits and restricts his prayer to modification of the order on quantum of sentence, to that of the sentence already undergone by the appellant, as she has already undergone a



period of 05 months and 22 days in custody and she is not involved in one more case in which she is on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the appellant as the learned Court below has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record and also she is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act, as such, she 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 50 grams of opium, i.e. intermediate quantity, attracting the offence of Section 18 (c) NDPS Act, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per her custody certificate, she is not involved in any other case and has already undergone an actual sentence of 05 months and 22 days out of total sentence of 01 year, in the instant case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section 18 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 vs. State of U.P. (2004) 7 SCC 257*, 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, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ravada Sasikala vs. 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 same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, the FIR (supra) was lodged on 05.09.2007 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last more than 17 years. Since her conviction, she 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 04.11.2010 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Karnal, is upheld.

**CRA-S-2828-SB-2010****-4-**

(ii) The order of sentence dated 08.11.2010 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 01 year and fine along 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

28.03.2025*Neha*

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No