

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRR-1301-2007
Date of decision: 25.09.2025

Kamaljeet SinghPetitioner
Versus
U.T., State, ChandigarhRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL
Present : Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rahul Arora, Addl. P.P., U.T., Chandigarh.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The present revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner, assailing the concurrent findings of conviction recorded against him under Sections 279, 337 and 304-A of IPC by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh, vide judgement dated 17.10.2003, as modified in appeal by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, on 24.07.2007, in case FIR No.14 dated 20.01.2001 under Sections 279/337/304-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 31, Chandigarh, whereby the petitioner has been sentenced as under:

Offence(s) under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
279 IPC	SI for 03 months	-	-
337 IPC	SI for 03 months	-	-
304-A IPC	SI for 09 months	-	-

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has, 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, he does not intend to assail the conviction of the petitioner on merits. His submission is confined solely to the quantum of sentence. It is urged that the accident pertains to the year 2001, and the petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of about 02 months. It is further submitted that the petitioner has endured the ordeal of protracted criminal proceedings, is peace-loving and law-abiding citizen, and has no other criminal antecedents. On these premises, learned counsel pleads for a lenient view, contending that no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the petitioner 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 petitioner, it has been submitted that the conviction calls for no interference. However, the learned State counsel is unable to dispute that subsequent to the accident of the year 2001, the petitioner has maintained good conduct and has 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 accident is of the year 2001, and taking note of the fact—undisputed by the learned State counsel, that the petitioner has 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 him back to prison at this stage of life, especially when he has 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 petitioner, his substantive sentence of simple imprisonment of 10 months is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

7. Ordered accordingly.

8. However, the petitioner is directed to deposit Rs.10,000/-as fine with the "Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh" within one month from the date of this order and a copy receipt of fine deposited be produced before the Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. It is made clear that in the event of non-deposit of the fine within a period of one month from today, the benefit of reduction of sentence shall not accrue to the petitioner, and he shall be required to undergo the remaining part of the sentence awarded to him.

9. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence and the fine, the revision petition stands disposed of.

25.09.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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