

112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

**CRR-582-2025 (O&M)**  
**DECIDED ON: 21.05.2025**

**RANJIT SINGH**

**.....PETITIONERS**

## VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.**

Present: Mr.B.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jastej Singh, Addl. A.G, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

1. The instant revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner challenging impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 15.11.2021 passed by SDJM, Samrala and against the judgment dated 24.02.2025 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana. The petitioner was awarded sentence as follows by SDJM, Samrala vide order dated 15.11.2021 :-

| Under Section | Term of Punishment | Fine                                                                |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 279 IPC       | RI for 6 months    | Rs. 1000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 2 weeks. |
| 337 IPC       | RI for 6 month     | nil                                                                 |
| 338 IPC       | RI 1 year          | Rs. 1000/- in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 2 weeks  |

2. Thereafter, against the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 15.11.2021 passed by SDJM, Samrala, petitioner preferred an



appeal before the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, who vide order dated 24.02.2025 upheld the impugned judgment and order of sentence dated 15.11.2021.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he does not want to challenge the conviction of the petitioner 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 petitioner did not challenge his 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 petitioner is concerned. As such, the conviction of the petitioner 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 petitioner has undergone the actual sentence of 2 months and 25 days out of total substantive sentence of 6 months as of now, as per the custody certificate of the petitioner filed by learned State counsel in Court today. Thus, this court is of the considered view that a chance be given to the petitioner 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 petitioner has not challenged his conviction on merits, while affirming his conviction, the order of sentence is modified to the extent to the period already undergone by him with no change in fine clause.



7. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.
8. The petitioner is ordered to be released forthwith in case he is not required in any other case.
9. The pending criminal misc. applications stands disposed off, as having been rendered infructuous.

21.05.2025

*anuradha*

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No*

*Whether reportable : Yes/No*