



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

204

1.

CRR-1110-2007

Date of decision: 24.09.2025

Punjab Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

2.

CRR-1075-2007

Date of decision: 24.09.2025

Gurdit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

3.

CRR-258-2008

Date of decision: 24.09.2025

Sucha Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Ashwani Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRR-1110-2007 & CRR-1075-2007.

Mr. Ishan Thakur, Advocate for
Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-258-2008.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The above referred Criminal Revisions arise from the judgement of conviction/order of sentence dated 19.07.2002 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mansa, as affirmed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa, vide judgement dated 24.02.2007, whereby the petitioners were convicted and sentenced, in case FIR

No.41 dated 28.05.1996 under Sections 326/324/323/148/149 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sardulgarh, as follows :

Name of the convict	Offence(s) under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
Punjab Singh	326 IPC	SI for 03 years	Rs.500/-	SI for 06 months
	143 IPC	SI for 03 months	Rs.100/-	SI for 15 days
Gurdit Singh	324 IPC	SI for 1 ½ years	Rs.500/-	SI for 02 months
	143 IPC	SI for 03 months	Rs.100/-	SI for 15 days
Sucha Singh	324 IPC	SI for 1 ½ years	Rs.500/-	SI for 02 months
	143 IPC	SI for 03 months	Rs.100/-	SI for 15 days
Balbir Singh	324 IPC	SI for 1 ½ years	Rs.500/-	SI for 02 months
	143 IPC	SI for 03 months	Rs.100/-	SI for 15 days

1A. However, the learned Appellate Court converted the imprisonment imposed upon the petitioner from simple imprisonment to rigorous imprisonment.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners have, at the very outset, fairly conceded that in view of the concurrent findings of fact recorded by the learned Trial Court and learned Appellate Court, they do not intend to assail the conviction of the petitioners on merits. Their submission is confined solely to the quantum of sentence. It is urged that the incident pertains to the year 1996, and petitioner-Punjab Singh has already undergone incarceration of more than 08 months, petitioner-Gurdit Singh has undergone incarceration of more than 05 months and petitioners Sucha Singh and Balbir Singh have already undergone incarceration of more than 11 months. It is further submitted

that the petitioners have endured the ordeal of protracted criminal proceedings, are peace-loving and law-abiding citizens, and have no other criminal antecedents. On these premises, learned counsel plead for a lenient view, contending that no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the petitioners to further incarceration.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for reduction of sentence while drawing attention to the concurrent findings recorded against the petitioners, it has been submitted that the conviction calls for no interference. However, the learned State counsel is unable to dispute that subsequent to the incident of the year 1996, the petitioners have maintained good conduct and have not been involved in any other criminal activity.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. In the considered view of this Court, having regard to the facts enumerated hereinabove, particularly the circumstance that the incident is of the year 1996, and taking note of the fact—undisputed by the learned State counsel, that the petitioners have not indulged in any other criminal act thereafter and has otherwise been leading a disciplined and law-abiding life, it would not be appropriate to send them back to prison at this stage of life, especially when they have already borne the brunt of prolonged trial proceedings.

6. In the totality of circumstances, ends of justice would be adequately met if, while upholding the conviction of the petitioners, their substantive sentence of rigorous imprisonment is reduced to the

period already undergone by them.

- 7. Ordered accordingly.
- 8. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, all the revision petitions stand disposed of accordingly.
- 9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

24.09.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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