



**254-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-28764-2016 in/and
CRR-3339-2016
Date of decision: 18.02.2025**

SHARANJIT SINGH AND OTHERS

...PETITIONERS

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mayank Mahla, Advocate and
Mr. Prashant Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

CRM-28764-2016

1. Instant application has been filed for condonation of delay of 48 days in filing the present revision petition.
2. For the reasons mentioned the application, the same is allowed.
3. Delay of 48 days in filing the present revision petition is condoned.

MAIN CASE

1. The present revision petition has been filed against the impugned judgment dated 18.03.2016 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, whereby judgment of conviction dated 09.06.2014 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rajpura has been upheld, however, order of sentence of even date has been modified by releasing the petitioners on probation for one year.



**CRM-28764-2016 in/and
CRR-3339-2016**

2

2. Brief facts of prosecution case are that on 14.02.2007, accused persons (petitioners herein) wrongfully restrained the complainant/respondent No.2 on a public place and caused him simple hurt. They also committed criminal intimidation by threatening the complainant/respondent No.2 with injury to his person and property. Hence, the FIR (*supra*) was registered.

3. On assessing all the material available on the record, the learned trial Court convicted and sentenced the petitioners-accused vide judgment and order of sentence dated 09.06.2014 for commission of offence under Sections 323/341/34 of IPC. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners preferred an appeal before the learned lower Appellate Court which was partly allowed and, they were released on probation for a period of one year with the condition that all the convicts shall deposit an amount of Rs.2,500/- each (total Rs.10,000/-) as compensation to be payable to the complainant/injured.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that in order to prove his version, the complainant/respondent No.2 examined CW-1 Sukhwant Singh, who deposed regarding the election held on 13.02.2007 and filthy language used by the petitioners towards the complainant and his family members. He also deposed regarding the injuries inflicted upon the persons of the complainant by the petitioners. Further, CW-2 i.e. father of the complainant also corroborated the version of complainant/respondent No.2. Thereafter, CW-3 Gulbahar Singh i.e. eye witness to the occurrence also deposed with regard to causing injuries by the accused persons to the complainant. He also deposed that he and his father Shamsher Singh, Sukhwant Singh *Ex-Sarpanch* and Joginder Singh saved the



**CRM-28764-2016 in/and
CRR-3339-2016**

3

complainant/respondent from the clutches of the accused persons. Furthermore, CW-4 Dr. Parminder Singh has also proved on record the MLR of the complainant and deposed regarding the injuries on his person. Thereafter, CW-5 i.e. complainant also deposed as per his version. As such, the prosecution has proved its case beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt and both the Courts below have passed a well reasoned judgment based on appreciation of evidence available on record.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds no perversity or illegality in findings recorded by the learned lower Appellate Court, which warrant interference. Hence, the instant revision petition stands dismissed.

February 18, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No