



CRR-1477-2017 (O&M)

1

262

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-1477-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.01.2025

FATEH SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, *Amicus Curiae*
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nitesh Sharma, DAG Punjab.

Harpreet Singh Brar, J. (Oral)

1. This revision has been preferred by the petitioner against the judgment dated 17.11.2016 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridkot upholding the judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence dated 19.07.2016 passed by learned Principal Magistrate Juvenile Justice Board, Faridkot vide which petitioner has been convicted under Sections 377 of Indian Penal Code and Section 5 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and was directed to be sent to Special Home/fit institution for a period of 02 years.

2. As per prosecution on 12.04.2014, Sheela Rani wife of Tulsi Ram (complainant-mother), was present in house alongwith two minor children. At about 3.00 PM, her son aged about 05 years (victim) went in street for playing. When he did not return, complainant alongwith her sister-in-law Paramjit Kaur (Jethani) went outside in order to search him. When both reached near house of Ram Singh, heard shriek of his son, saw that son of Ram Singh (petitioner herein) has put off his pant and nicker, was committing sodomy with minor son

(victim). She picked up her son and telephonically informed her husband. Victim



was taken to Civil Hospital, Jaitu, from where he was referred to GGS Medical College & Hospital, Faridkot, where police officials met her and her statement was recorded. Medico-legal examination of victim was conducted. Arrest of petitioner-jvenile was effected.

3. On assessing all the material available on the record, the petitioner was convicted vide judgment dated 19.07.2016 by learned Principal Magistrate Juvenile Justice Board, Faridkot. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner preferred an appeal, which was dismissed by learned lower Appellate Court vide judgment dated 17.11.2016.

4. Learned counsel (*amicus curiae*) *inter alia* contends that learned Courts below have failed to appreciated that no identification parade was conducted during investigation. He further contends that evidence of child witness ought to be corroborated in material particulars as the child may not know meaning of such complicated words. Thus the main ingredients of Section 377 of IPC and Section 5 of POCSO Act are not made out. Therefore, the findings recorded by learned Courts below are liable to be set aside. He further submits that the petitioner has already undergone 01 month and 07 days of custody and not involved in any other criminal activity.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of petitioner as the learned PMJJB, Faridkot has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record and the same has also been upheld by the learned lower Appellate Court. As such, the petitioner does not merit any leniency.

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



7. The legislature has consistently made it clear that a juvenile delinquent must only be remanded to a special home, which is evidenced by the fact that both Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (hereinafter 'the Act of 2000') as well Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereinafter 'the Act of 2015') contain specific provision to that effect. Section 15(1)(g) of the Act of 2000 reads as follows:

15 . Order that may be passed regarding juvenile.-

(1) Where a Board is satisfied on inquiry that a juvenile has committed an offence, then, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any other law for the time being in force, the Board may, if it thinks so fit,-

xxx

xxx

xxx

(g) make an order directing the juvenile to be sent to a special home,-

- (i) in the case of juvenile, over seventeen years but less than eighteen years of age for a period of not less than two years;*
- (ii) in case of any other juvenile for the period until he ceases to be a juvenile:*

Provided that the Board may, if it is satisfied that having regard to the nature of the offence and the circumstances of the case it is expedient so to do, for reasons to be recorded, reduce the period of stay to such period as it thinks fit.

While Section 18(1)(g) of the Act of 2015 reads as follows:

18. Orders regarding child found to be in conflict with law.—

(1) Where a Board is satisfied on inquiry that a child irrespective of age has committed a petty offence, or a serious offence, or a child below the age of sixteen years has committed a heinous offence, or a child above the age of sixteen years has committed a heinous offence and the Board has, after preliminary assessment under Section 15, disposed of the matter then, notwithstanding anything contrary contained in any other law for the time being in force, and based on the nature of offence, specific need for supervision or intervention, circumstances as brought out in the social investigation report and past conduct of the child, the Board may, if it so thinks fit,—

xxx

xxx

xxx

(g) direct the child to be sent to a special home, for such period, not exceeding three years, as it thinks fit, for providing reformatory services including education, skill development, counselling, behaviour modification therapy, and psychiatric support during the period of stay in the special home"



8. As such, it is the mandate of law to remand a juvenile offender, tried under the Act of 2000 or the Act of 2015, to a special home only, on establishment of his guilt. It is trite law that if a certain method is prescribed by law, it must be followed to accomplish that specific task, necessarily forbidding the use of other methods. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dharani Sugars and Chemicals Ltd. vs. Union of India and others (2019) 5 SCC 480***. Therefore, since a special law occupies the field and categorically prescribes for a juvenile delinquent to only be sent to a special home, he cannot be remanded to any other correctional facilities. However, due to the time consumed in adjudicating upon the revision petition filed by him, the petitioner, originally convicted as a juvenile, has now attained majority. Therefore, he cannot be ordered to undergo the sentence imposed upon him in a special home or a regular penitentiary. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that ends of justice will be met if the sentence imposed upon the the petitioner is reduced to that already undergone by him.

9. A two Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Mahesh vs. State of Rajasthan and others 2018(2) R.C.R.(Criminal) 687***, dealt with a similar matter wherein the accused was convicted as a juvenile but had attained majority at the time of decision of the appeal. Taking into account the efflux of time and the fact that the accused was now a middle aged man who cannot be sent to a remand home, the following observations were made:

“9. The present is a case where the accused appellants though juveniles on the date of commission of the alleged crime are, as on today, middle aged persons. The accused appellant - Mahesh in Criminal Appeal arising out of Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.2934 of 2015 had undergone the custody for a period of nearly one year whereas the accused appellant - Arjun in Criminal Appeal arising out of Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.5370 of 2015 had suffered custody for about eight (08) months. The maximum sentence, as already noted, is three years. Having regard to the



long efflux of time we are of the view that it will not be necessary, in the facts of the present cases, to cause a remand of the matter to the Juvenile Justice Board for a decision on the quantum of sentence for the reason even if such a remand is made and the Juvenile Justice Board comes to a decision that in addition to the period of custody suffered by the accused appellants they need to suffer a further period of custody, such custody can only be in a remand home or a protection home to which places the accused appellants, because of their age as on today, cannot be sent.

10. On the contrary, having regard to the period of custody suffered; the age of the accused appellants as on date; the efflux of time since the date of occurrence and all other relevant facts and circumstances we are of the view that while maintaining the conviction of the accused appellants the sentence imposed should be modified to one of the period undergone. We order accordingly.” (emphasis added)

Reliance in this regard can also be placed upon the judgments rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Babban Rai and another vs. State of Bihar (2007)13 SCC 88***, ***Pradeep Kumar vs. State of U.P. 1994 AIR SC 104*** and this Court in ***Sanjay alias Kala vs. State of Haryana 2011(2) R.C.R.(Criminal) 899***, ***Rajesh Kumar vs. State of Haryana 2011(1) R.C.R. (Criminal) 830*** and ***Rohit vs. State of Haryana in CRR-56-2017 decided on 31.10.2017.***

10. In ***Deo Narain Mandal v. State 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 excess-

ively harsh nor does it come across as lenient. 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 the conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

11. 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. Moreover, *amicus curiae* submits that petitioner-juvenile has already undergone a period of 01 month and 07 days of custody and not involved in any other case and deserves leniency from this Court.

12. The FIR in the present case was lodged on 13.04.2014 and petitioner has been suffering the agony of protracted trial for almost 10 years. Since his conviction, petitioner has grown into a law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life.

13. Accordingly, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

14. Consequently, the present revision petition is disposed of and the judgment dated 17.11.2016 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridkot affirming the judgment of conviction passed by learned Principal



CRR-1477-2017 (O&M)

7

sentence dated 19.07.2016 is modified to the extent that the sentence of special home for 02 years along with default mechanism awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

15. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.
16. High Court Legal Services Committee is directed to pay remuneration to *amicus curiae* as per rules.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

23.01.2025
Ajay Goswami

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>