

CRM-35661-2024 in/&
CRR-1681-2024
Decided on : 26.09.2025

..... Petitioner

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

Present : Mr. Lovish Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Prince Pasricha, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Vinod S. Bhardwaj, J.(Oral)

1. The instant revision petition has been filed against the impugned judgment and order dated 28.02.2022 passed by JMIC, Ferozepur in case arising out of FIR No.70 of 05.07.2016 under Section 380, 411 IPC registered at Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur, whereby the petitioner had been convicted and sentenced as under:-

Offence	Imprisonment	Fine	In default of payment of fine
U/Section 380 IPC	RI for two years	Rs.5000/-	Two months RI

Challenge also is to the judgment in appeal passed by the Judge, Special Court-cum-Additional District and Sessions Judge-cum-Fast Track Court, vide judgment dated 06.08.2024 dismissing the same. Aggrieved thereof, the present petition has been filed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have amicably resolved the dispute and a compromise has been effected between



them. Affidavit of complainant-respondent No.2 in support thereof is also appended as Annexure A-1. Parties were directed to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded in support of the settlement.

3. In compliance of order dated 10.09.2025, report of trial Court has also been received wherein it is submitted that the matter has been voluntarily and willfully compromised between the parties and it is without any pressure or undue influence. Photocopies of the statements of the parties have also been annexed with the report.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not press the present petition on the merits and confined his prayer only to the quantum of punishment as imposed by the trial Court since the incident in question pertains to the year 2016 and the petitioner has faced the agony of trial for more than 9 years. 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.

5. 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 and the petition is dismissed to the extent of challenge to conviction.

6. State counsel does not dispute the settlement amongst the parties.

7. The object of sentencing is not only deterrent and punitive but also reformatory and rehabilitative. The offence in question is not an offence against public at large or detrimental to social order. The offence is also not shocking to the judicial conscience. There is also nothing on record to show that petitioner was involved in any other criminal case or that the petitioner has involved himself in any case after registration of the present case.



8. Resolution of dispute by way of settlement of the dispute, fully and finally is the finest hour of justice. It is a permanent resolution of the dispute instead of just a judicial adjudication. The parties opting to resolve the dispute should be promoted. The evolving legal jurisprudence seeks to promote mediation and conciliation instead of litigation.

9. The petitioner has already undergone an actual sentence of 13 days, out of total sentence of 02 years as imposed by the trial Court. Further, the petitioner has faced the criminal trial for the last more than 9 years. Keeping in view that a compromise has been effected between the parties, I deem it to be a fit case for reduction of sentence, in best interest of the parties. Hence, the sentence is modified and reduced to that already undergone. The sentence of fine and punishment in default thereof is to remain the same.

10. The present petition is accordingly ***partly allowed***. While petition is dismissed to the extent of challenge to conviction, the order of sentence is modified and the sentence is reduced to that already undergone but the order with respect to fine and sentence in default thereof is maintained. Accused, if in custody, be released in this case, if not required in any other case.

11. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

26.09.2025

sonia

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No