

**206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****CRA-S-3212-SB-2010****Date of Decision: April 04, 2025****Rajesh Kumar****... Appellant****Versus**

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**Present:-** Mr. Aaftab Hasan, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rajeev K. Takkar, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Appellant- Rajesh Kumar was tried by learned Judge, Special Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib, in a case arising out of FIR No.203 dated 22.10.2004 under Section 15 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Lambi, as he was found in possession of 22 Kg 250 of poppy husk. After trial, the appellant was convicted under Section 15 of the NDPS Act vide judgment dated 11.12.2010 by the trial Court and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years and to pay fine of ₹5,000/- with default sentence of 06 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 does not press the appeal against the judgment of conviction; and that appellant confines 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 2004; that appellant was young person of 30 years at that time; that appellant has already undergone actual sentence of 05 months and 23 days and is not involved in any other case and so, he deserves 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 has already undergone actual custody sentence of 05 months and 23 days. It is revealed further that he has no criminal antecedents. Nothing has been brought on record to suggest that after this conviction, appellant has been involved in any other case. He was young pearson of 30 years of age at the time of offence, which had taken place way back in 2004 i.e. 21 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 the fine is concerned, it will remain same.

Disposed of.

April 04, 2025
sarita

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

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