

217

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-1725-2012
Date of decision:21.04.2025

DHANI RAM AND ANR. ..Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA ..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Abhisar Chaudhary, Advocate with
Ms. Geetanjali Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harkesh Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, (ORAL).

1. This revision petition has been preferred against the judgment dated 18.05.2012 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Faridabad , vide which, judgment of conviction dated 15.07.2010 and order on quantum of sentence dated 19.07.2010 passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridabad, have been upheld, in case stemming from FIR No.176 dated 14.03.2000 registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 120-B of IPC at Police Station Central, Faridabad and the petitioners were sentenced as under :

Offence under Section(s)	Sentence
419 IPC read with Section 120 IPC	RI for 1 year to each petitioner
420 IPC read with Section 120 IPC	RI for 1 year and to pay fine of Rs.2000/- to each petitioner.
467 IPC read with Section 120 IPC	RI for 2 years and fine of Rs.2000/- to each petitioner.
471 IPC read with Section 120 IPC	RI for 2 years and fine of Rs.2000/- to

	each petitioner. In default of payment of fine to further undergo SI for 1 month each.
--	--

It was ordered that all sentences shall run concurrently.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that they are not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 15.07.2010 on merits and restricts his prayer to modification of the order on quantum of sentence to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioners. As per their custody certificate, the petitioner-Dhani Ram has undergone actual custody period of 3 months and 6 days, out of total sentence of 2 years and petitioner-Gianwati has undergone actual custody period of 2 months and 23 days out of total sentence of 2 years awarded by learned trial Court and are not involved in any other case.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioners as learned trial Court has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record, which has also been upheld by the learned lower Appellate Court and as such, they do not deserve any leniency.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

5. In ***Deo Narain Mandal v. State of UP (2004) 7 SCC 257***, a Three Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has opined 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, 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.

6. Further, a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ravada Sasikala v. State of AP AIR 2017 SC 1166***, has reiterated 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 the conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

7. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the learned trial Court indicates no perversity in its findings and the same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. It transpires that the petitioners were convicted under Sections 419, 420, 467, 471 read with Section 120-B of IPC, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioners has not assailed the judgment of conviction on merits, rather he has restricted his prayer only qua modification of quantum of sentence.

**CRR-1725-2012****4**

8. The FIR in the present case was lodged on 14.03.2000 and the petitioners have been suffering the agony of trial for the last more than 25 years. Since their conviction, the petitioners have grown into law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life. As per their custody certificate, the petitioner-Dhani Ram has undergone actual custody period of 3 months and 6 days and petitioner-Gianwati has undergone actual custody period of 2 months and 23 days out of total sentence of 2 years awarded by learned trial Court and they are not involved in any other case.

9. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Sections 419, 420, 467, 471 read with Section 120-B IPC, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to the petitioners is reduced to the period already undergone by them.

10. Consequently, the present petition is disposed of and the judgment dated 18.05.2012 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad affirming the judgment of conviction is upheld, however, the order of sentence dated 19.07.2010 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 2 years along with default mechanism awarded to the petitioners is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by them.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

21.04.2025*Poonam***(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE**

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