

210 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-373-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 05.04.2025

MATIN AND ANR

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. D.S. Matya, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr. S.S. Pannu, Addl. A.G, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The instant revision petition has been preferred by the petitioners challenging impugned judgments dated 13.02.2023 passed by JMIC, Gurugram and dated 24.01.2025 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram. The petitioners were awarded sentence as follows by JMIC, Gurugram vide order dated 13.02.2023 :-

Under Section	Term of Punishment	Fine
420 IPC	SI for 2 years	Rs. 2000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 1 months
467 IPC	SI for 2 year	Rs. 3000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 1 month
468 IPC	SI 1 year	Rs. 1000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 1 month
471 IPC	SI for 1 year	Rs. 1000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 1 month



2. Thereafter, against the impugned judgment dated 13.02.2023 and order of sentence of even date petitioners preferred an appeal before the Court of Sessions Judge, Gurugram and Addl. Sessions Judge, Gurugram vide judgment dated 24.01.2025 acquitted the petitioners for offences u/s 420, 467, 468 IPC however, upheld the conviction under Section 471 IPC.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that he does not want to challenge the conviction of the petitioners on merits. However, he submits that in view of the circumstances of the case, the sentence awarded by the trial Court is on higher side.

4. Here it would be pertinent to mention that the petitioners did not challenge their conviction on merits and only confined his relief qua quantum of sentence. This Court has also scrutinized the impugned judgment as well as the relevant documents/evidence and is of the considered view that there is no scope for any interference in impugned judgment as far as the conviction of the petitioners is concerned. As such, the conviction of the petitioners is upheld.

5. As far as quantum of sentence is concerned, there are mitigating circumstances to take a lenient view in the matter of sentence awarded by the trial court. The petitioners have undergone the actual sentence of 6 months and 07 days out of total substantive sentence of 1 year as of now, as per the custody certificate of the petitioners filed by learned State counsel in Court today. Thus, this court is of the considered view that a chance be given to the petitioners to reform & improve themselves; to become a good citizen; and to lead a peaceful & harmonious life.

6. Taking into consideration the above narrated discussion as well as the fact that the petitioners have not challenged his conviction on merits, while



affirming their conviction, the order of sentence is modified to the extent to the period already undergone by them with no change in fine clause.

7. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

8. The petitioners are ordered to be released forthwith in case they are not required in any other case.

9. The pending criminal misc. applications stands disposed off, as having been rendered infructuous.

05.04.2025

anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No0