



CRR-2671-2010

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRR-2671-2010

Date of decision : 06.11.2025

TEJPAL SINGH**... PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****.. RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Ms. Shruti, Advocate (Amicus Curiae)
for the petitioner.
Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This revision petition has been filed against the judgment dated 18.09.2010 passed by Id. Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC) Narnaul, vide which the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 01.05.2006 passed by Id. Sub-Judicial Magistrate, Mohindergarh has been upheld whereby the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years and to pay a fine of Rs. 5000/- under Section 409 IPC. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for two months.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that a complaint was filed by the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Mohindergarh against the accused, Tejpal Singh, former Sarpanch of village Beri. It was alleged in the complaint that on 16.06.1994, the Shamlat land situated in the village Beri was leased out for one year for a sum of ₹15,900/-. After leasing the land, the payment was received by the accused Tejpal Singh in his capacity as Sarpanch, and a receipt in Form No. 4 was issued to the lessee. However, the said amount was never deposited in the account of the Gram Panchayat and was misappropriated by the accused.



CRR-2671-2010

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that she is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction on merits and restricts her prayer qua modification of the order on quantum of sentence. She also contends that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of 02 months and 28 days out of the awarded sentence of two years. The petitioner is not involved in any other case. She prays that since FIR in question pertains to the year 1995, a lenient view may be taken while passing an order on quantum by this Court.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioner and has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. He further submits that the Courts below have passed well reasoned judgments based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. He has not refuted the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. The FIR in the present case pertains to the year 1995 and he has already faced the rigors of the trial for more than 30 years.

7. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in "*Deo Narain Mandal Vs. State of UP*", (2004) 7 SCC 257, has held that awarding of sentence is not a mere formality in criminal cases. When a minimum and maximum term is prescribed by the statute with regard to the period of sentence, a discretionary element is vested in the Court. Background of each case, which includes factors like gravity of the offence, the manner in which the offence is committed, age of the petitioner, should be considered while determining the quantum of sentence and this discretion is not to be used arbitrarily or whimsically. After assessing all relevant factors, proper sentence should be awarded bearing in mind the principle of



CRR-2671-2010

-3-

proportionality to ensure the sentence is neither excessively harsh nor does it come across as lenient.

8. Further, a Division Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ravada Sasikala Vs. State of AP, AIR 2017 SC 1166***, has held that the imposition of sentence also serves a social purpose, as it acts as a deterrent by making the accused realise the damage caused not only to the victim, but also to the society at large. The law in this regard is well settled that opportunities of reformation must be granted and such discretion is to be exercised by evaluating all attending circumstances of each case by noticing the nature of the crime, the manner, in which the crime was committed and conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

9. A perusal of the judgment passed by the Courts below indicates no perversity in their findings and the same are based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, learned counsel for the petitioner has not assailed the judgments, rather restricted the prayer only qua modification of quantum of sentence to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioner.

10. As far as the question of quantum of sentence is concerned, it is worthwhile to note that the occurrence in this case pertains to the year 1995. The right to speedy and expeditious trial is one of the most valuable and cherished rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The petitioner has already suffered the agony of protracted trial, spanning over a period of more than 30 years and has been in the corridors of the court for this prolonged period. In view of the facts noted above, the case of the petitioner deserves to be dealt with leniency. The petitioner also deserves the benefit of the consistent view taken by this court in this regard. Thus, guided by the judicial pronouncements made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of ***Haripada Das Vs. State of West Bengal*** reported



CRR-2671-2010

-4-

in (1998) 9 SCC 678 and Alister Anthony Pareira vs. [2023:RJ-JD:28174] (5 of 5) [CRLR-755/2003] State of Maharashtra reported in 2012 2 SCC 648 and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, age of the petitioner, his status in the society and the fact that he faced financial hardship and had to go through mental agony, this court is of the view that ends of justice would be met if sentence imposed upon the petitioner is reduced to the period as already undergone by him.

11. Accordingly, judgments passed by the Id. Appellate Court as well as Id. Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Mohindergarh are hereby affirmed but the quantum of sentence awarded by the Courts concerned under Sections 409 of IPC has been modified and reduced to the period of sentence as already undergone by him. The petitioner is on bail. He need not surrender. His bail bonds are discharged. However, the amount of fine of Rs.5,000/- imposed upon the petitioner by the Id. Trial Court is enhanced to Rs. 10,000/-. The petitioner is directed to deposit the enhanced amount of fine in the learned trial Court within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case of default of payment of fine, he will be liable to be taken into custody and made to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two months.

12. With these modifications, the present revision petition is disposed of.

13. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

06.11.2025

renu

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