



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**
202

CRR-3173-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 03.05.2025

Mukhtiar Singh and others
.....Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. H.S. Saggu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This revision petition has been preferred against the judgment dated 26.09.2014 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, vide which judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence dated 14.08.2012 passed by the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Gidderbaha, in FIR No.107 dated 22.09.2003 registered under Sections 323, 325, 34 IPC at Police Station Kot Bhai, have been partly allowed and order of sentence has been modified.
2. The sentence of the petitioners has been modified by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib as follows:

Petitioner No.1 – Mukhtiar Singh	
Offence	Sentence
Section 323 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of Rs.1,000/- (Sentence reduced from 01 year)



Section 325 read with Section 34 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 01 year and to pay fine of Rs.2,000/- (Sentence reduced from 02 years)
Petitioner No.2 – Tota Singh	
Offence	Sentence
Section 323 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of Rs.1,000/- (Sentence reduced from 01 year)
Section 325 read with Section 34 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 01 year and to pay fine of Rs.2,000/- (Sentence reduced from 02 years)
Petitioner No.3 – Mithu Singh	
Offence	Sentence
Section 323 read with Section 34 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of Rs.1,000/- (Sentence reduced from 01 year)
Section 325 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 01 year and to pay fine of Rs.2,000/- (Sentence reduced from 02 years)

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 26.09.2014 on merits and restricts his prayer qua modification of the order on quantum of sentence, to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioners, as all the petitioners have already undergone a period of 01 month and 13 days each, including remissions and they are not involved in any other criminal activity.
4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioners on the ground that the 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, the petitioners do not deserve any leniency.



5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the petitioners were convicted under Sections 323, 325, 34 IPC, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per the custody certificate, the petitioners are not involved in any other case and have already undergone an actual sentence of 01 month and 13 days each, including remissions out of total sentence of 01 year each, in the instant case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Sections 323, 325, 34 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.

6. In ***Deo Narain Mandal Vs. 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, 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.



7. Further, a two-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ravada Sasikala Vs. 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 conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

8. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the learned Court below indicates no perversity in its findings and the same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. 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 already undergone by the petitioners.

9. The FIR in the present case was registered on 22.09.2003 and the petitioners are suffering the agony of trial since the last more than 21 years. Since their conviction, the petitioners have grown into a law-abiding citizen and desire to live a peaceful life.

10. Consequently, the present revision petition is disposed of in the following terms:-



- (i) The judgment dated 26.09.2014 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, affirming the judgment of conviction dated 14.08.2012 is upheld.*
- (ii) The order of sentence is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for a period of 01 year each and fine awarded to the petitioners is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by them.*

11. All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

03.05.2025
yakub

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