

2025:PHHC:130393



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

201

(1) CRR-2140-2008

SOHAN SINGH AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

(2) CRR-14-2009 (O&M)

GAMDOOR SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

Date of decision: September 19, 2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Arshdeep Singh Sivia, Advocate and
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRR-2140-2008).

Mr. Jasdev Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRR-14-2009).

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant revision petitions have been preferred against the judgment of conviction/order of sentence dated 10.10.2006 passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridkot, in case Criminal Complaint No.40 dated 20.10.1996 (RT No.270 dated 17.09.2002) registered under Sections 193/195/205/120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, convicting and sentencing the petitioners, which judgment was upheld by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridkot, on 10.10.2008.



2. The petitioners were sentenced to undergo imprisonment as follows:-

Offence(s) under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed on each	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
193 IPC	RI for 2 years	Rs.5,000/-	RI for 6 months
205 IPC	RI for 1 year	Rs.1,000/-	RI for 1 month
120-B IPC	RI for 6 months	-	-

2A. All the sentences were ordered to be run concurrently.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has, at the very outset, fairly conceded that in view of the concurrent findings recorded by the learned Trial Court and learned Appellate Court, he does not intend to assail the conviction of the petitioners on merits. His submission is confined solely to the quantum of sentence. It is urged that the complaint pertains to the year 1996, and the petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of 4 months out of two years. 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 pleads for a lenient view, contending that no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the petitioners to further incarceration.

4. *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 complaint of the year 1996, the petitioners have maintained good conduct and have not been involved in any other criminal activity.

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

6. In the considered view of this Court, having regard to the facts enumerated hereinabove, particularly the circumstance that the complaint pertains to 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 have 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.

7. 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 for a period of two years is reduced to the period already undergone.

8. Ordered accordingly.

9. However, there shall be no modification with regard to the fine imposed.



10. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence and, the instant revision petitions stand disposed of.

September 19, 2025
Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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