



261

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-1747-SB-2018
Date of decision: 14.07.2025

AMARJIT KAUR @ MANO

V/S

...APPELLANT

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Komal Preet Sohi, Advocate for
Mr. C.S. Rana, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer in the present appeal is to set aside the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 06.07.2017 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur, whereby, the appellant was convicted and sentenced for the offence punishable under Section 21 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as ‘NDPS Act’), in the case stemming from FIR No.95 dated 28.04.2015 registered under Section 22 of NDPS Act at Police Station City Sangrur.
2. The appellant was sentenced for keeping in her possession intoxicants, as mentioned below:

Offence	Sentence
Section 21 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of one and half years and to pay fine of Rs.15,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo RI for 03 months.



3. Learned Counsel for the appellant *inter alia* contends that mandatory safeguards provided under Section 50 of NDPS Act were not followed. Further, CFSL form 29 was not filled at the spot by the Investigating Officer and there is a delay of sending sample to FSL. She further contends that the appellant is a lady. She submits that she is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 06.07.2017 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur on merits and restricts her prayer to modification of the order on quantum of sentence dated 06.07.2017 to that of sentence already undergone by the appellant. As per the custody certificate, the appellant has undergone a period of 09 months and 02 days.

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 as such, she does not deserve any leniency. He further submits that the appellant has been convicted in five more cases, however, he could not controvert the fact that the appellant has completed her sentence in all those cases, mentioned in custody certificate. Moreover, the appellant has been acquitted in four cases, in which, her presence was secured through production warrants.

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 intoxicants, which falls under the purview of Section 22 of NDPS Act. As per the custody certificate, the appellant has undergone a period of 09 months and 02 days, out of total sentence of one and half years, in the instant case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section 21 NDPS Act, for the non-commercial quantity 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 28.04.2015 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last more than 10 years. Since her conviction, she has grown into law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life.

9. Therefore, in view of the discussion above, present appeal is disposed of in the following terms:-

- (i) The judgment dated 06.07.2017 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Sangur is upheld.
- (ii) The order of sentence dated 06.07.2017 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for one and half years along with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by her.

July 14, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |