



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

249

CRR-91-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 03.09.2025

Pardeep Singh ...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab ...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rahi Mehra, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(Legal Aid Counsel).

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant revision petition has been filed against the impugned judgment and order dated 15.05.2015 passed by Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Khanna in case bearing No.C-41-1229/2013 arising out of case bearing FIR No.42 of 23.02.2013 under Sections 182, 193, 217 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 registered at Police Station City Khanna, whereby the petitioner had been convicted and sentenced as under:-

S. no.	Under Section(s)	Punishment
1.	182 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860	To undergo for six months and to pay find of Rs.500/- and in default of payment of fine to further undergo RI for a period of 01 month.
2.	3 the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984	Rigorous imprisonment for 01 year with fine of Rs. 500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo RI for a period of 01 month.



2. Appeal preferred against the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence was also dismissed by Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide judgment dated 11.10.2017. Aggrieved thereof, the present petition has been filed.

3. On 16.01.2018, it was submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he would not press the petition on the merits and restricted his prayer only to the quantum of sentence as imposed by the trial Court and the following order was passed:-

“Counsel for the petitioner does not press the petition on merits and restricts his prayer only to the quantum of sentence, which has been imposed by the Courts below.

Notice of motion to the limited extent, as prayed for, for 16.03.2018.”

4. Since there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner, hence, it is deemed expedient to nominate a Legal Aid Counsel on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Rahi Mehra, Advocate who is present in the Court, is nominated as a Legal Aid Counsel to assist this Court on behalf of petitioner.

5. After obtaining the file from the learned State counsel and perusing the same, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner has already undergone an actual sentence of 05 months and 04 days, out of total sentence of 01 year as imposed by the learned trial Court. It is submitted that the incident in question pertains to



249

CRR-91-2018 (O&M)

the year 2013 and a period of more than 12 years has elapsed in the meanwhile. The petitioner has also not involved himself in any other criminal activity/case, he thus prays that the sentence of the petitioner be reduced to that already undergone.

6. Since the counsel for the petitioner has confined his challenge and prayer only to the quantum of sentence, hence, merits of the case need not be gone into.

7. Taking into consideration the contention of the petitioner and that the petitioner has already undergone an actual sentence of 05 months and 04 days, out of total sentence of 01 year as imposed by the trial Court, I deem it to be a fit case for reduction of sentence.

8. Petition is accordingly ***partly allowed*** in the terms as aforesaid.

9. A copy of this order be sent to the High Court Legal Services Committee for information and necessary action.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

03.09.2025

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No