

**CRR-1379-2012 (O&M)****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****236****CRR-1379-2012 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.11.2025****Harpreet singh****.....Petitioner****Vs.****State of Punjab****....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate, and
Mr. G. S. Benipal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been filed against the impugned judgment dated 29.03.2012 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali), whereby the appeal of the petitioner was dismissed with modification of the order of sentence dated 03.03.2010 passed by the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Kharar, in case FIR No. 15 dated 14.01.2007 registered under Sections 279, 337, 338, 304-A, and 427 IPC at Police Station Kharar. Vide the said judgment, the petitioner was convicted under Sections 279, 337, 338, and 304-A IPC and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of two years.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 13.01.2007, complainant Amritpal, along with his father Harbans Singh, mother Baljit Kaur, and elder brother Gurjit Singh, was proceeding towards Village Ballo Majra in a Maruti car. At about 10:30 p.m., when they reached near Sunny Enclave,



Mundi Kharar, one Tavera vehicle bearing registration No. PB-12H-0049, being driven rashly, negligently, and at a high speed, came from the Chandigarh side and struck against their car. At the time of the accident, Harbans Singh, father of the complainant, was driving the car, and the complainant was sitting on the front seat with him. As a result of the impact, Harbans Singh sustained head injuries and died at the spot. The driver of the offending vehicle was apprehended at the scene. Thereafter, a formal FIR, i.e., FIR No. 15 dated 14.01.2007, was registered against the driver of the Tavera vehicle under Sections 279, 337, 338, 304-A, and 427 of the IPC. After considering the evidence and hearing both sides, the learned trial Court convicted Harpreet Singh, the driver of the offending vehicle, and sentenced him to undergo two years' imprisonment. Aggrieved therefrom, Harpreet Singh preferred an appeal before the learned appellate Court, which modified the judgment of the trial Court by reducing the sentence from two years to one year under Section 304-A IPC. Still aggrieved, the petitioner has filed the present revision petition before this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 29.03.2012 on merits and restricts his prayer qua modification of the order on quantum of sentence, to the period as already undergone by the petitioner, as he has already undergone a period of 04 months and 16 days out of total sentence of 1 year. He further prays that since the FIR in question pertains to the year 2007, a lenient view may be taken while passing an order/ judgment by this Court.



4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioner by way of filing of custody certificate dated 11.11.2025 and submits that the learned Courts below have passed well-reasoned judgments based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record.

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

6. The petitioner has been convicted for rash and negligent driving and for causing death of a person, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. Moreover, the FIR in the present case pertains to the year 2007 and the petitioner has already faced the rigours of the trial for more than 18 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 accused, 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 proportionality to ensure the sentence is neither excessively harsh nor does it come across as lenient.

8. Further, a two-Judges 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 of conviction passed by the learned Courts below indicate no perversity in its findings and the same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, learned counsel for the petitioner has not assailed the judgment of conviction on merits, rather restricted the prayer only qua modification of quantum of sentence to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioner.

10. Since the FIR in the present case was registered on 14.01.2007 and the petitioner has been suffering the agony of trial since the last more than 18 years and the fact that the FIR is of the year 2007 and the petitioner has faced the rigours of trial for a period of more than 18 years, therefore, while taking a lenient view, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice if the sentence awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

11. In view of above, the present revision petition is **disposed of** by upholding the judgment of conviction dated 29.03.2012 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali), however the order of sentence dated 29.03.2012 is modified to the extent that the sentence of



rigorous imprisonment for a period of 1 year imposed upon the petitioner is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him. However, the amount of fine imposed upon the petitioner is enhanced to ₹10,000/-, which shall be paid to the legal representatives of the deceased within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

12. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

11.11.2025
anil

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No