



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

365-1

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.04.2026

Balwinder Kumar

...Appellant

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

365-2

CRA-S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.04.2026

Babu Singh

.....Appellant

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Prateek Garg, Advocate(PH-3877-2024, Mob No.86073-02727)
Legal Aid Counsel for the appellants.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both these appeals are being decided by this order as they arise out of the same occurrence and have been preferred separately by the different accused-convicts.

2. Reference to the facts however is being made from **CRA-S-1725-2011** titled as “**Balwinder Kumar Vs. State of Punjab**”.

3. The appeal(s) have been preferred against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 12.03.2011 passed by the Judge, Special Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib, in Sessions case No.349 dated 20.10.2005 (RT No. 352 of 23.02.2007) arising out of FIR bearing No.202 dated 01.06.2005, registered under Sections 15 of the Narcotics & Psychotropic

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Lambi, whereby both the appellants had been convicted for commission of offenses under Section 15 of the NDPS Act and sentenced as under :

Offence	Imprisonment	Fine	In default of payment of fine
Section 15 NDPS Act	3 years 6 months RI	Rs.30,000/- (each)	9 months RI

4. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 01.06.2005, a police party headed by SI Gurbachan Singh, while on patrol duty, received secret information that Babu Singh and Balwinder Kumar were selling poppy husk near a kinnow orchard in Village Luhara. Acting upon the said information, the police party proceeded to the indicated spot and, after associating an independent witness, reached near the orchard. At the spot, two persons were found standing with a bicycle carrying a gunny bag on its carrier, from which poppy husk was visible. Both persons were apprehended and identified as Babu Singh and Balwinder Kumar. After informing them of their right of search and upon their consent, the police conducted a search of the bag, which led to the recovery of 30 kilograms of poppy husk, out of which 250 grams was separated as a sample and the remaining quantity was sealed. During personal search, cash amounts of Rs.265/- from Babu Singh and Rs.65/- from Balwinder Kumar were also recovered. Thereafter, both the accused were arrested in the present case.

5. Copies of the challan and other relevant documents were supplied to the accused in compliance with law. Upon consideration of the material on record, a prima facie case for the offence punishable under Section 15 of the NDPS Act was found to be made out and charges were

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

accordingly framed against the accused. The accused pleaded not guilty to the said charges and claimed trial.

6. On completion of the procedural compliances, parties led their respective evidence. The prosecution examined PW1 HC Lakhwinder Singh (recovery witness), PW2 HC Harpinder Singh, PW3 HC Nazar Singh (another recovery witness), PW4 HC Surjit Singh (MHC of the Police Station) and PW5 Gorjant Singh (Retired Inspector SHO) and thereafter closed its evidence.

7. The entire evidence was put to the petitioner and his statement under Section 313 Cr. P.C. was recorded. He denied the same but led no evidence in defence.

8. On consideration of the evidence and hearing the arguments, the Judge, Special Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib convicted the appellants vide judgment dated 12.03.2011 and sentenced them as mentioned above. Hence, the present appeal.

9. Since, there was no representation on the behalf of the appellant(s) and the position remains unchanged today as well. Accordingly, Mr. Prateek Garg, Advocate, who is present in the Court is appointed as a Legal Aid Counsel to assist this Court on behalf of the appellant(s) in both the cases. After going through the paper-books, he assails the impugned judgment and order of conviction on the ground that the learned Courts have failed to properly appreciate both the oral as well as documentary evidence brought on record. It is contended that material aspects of the prosecution case have been overlooked and the findings recorded are based on surmises and conjectures rather than on a sound

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

appreciation of evidence. It is further submitted that the prosecution has miserably failed to establish its case against the appellant beyond reasonable doubt. As per the prosecution version itself, the case originates from a secret information received by the Investigating Officer. However, it is contended that the said information was not reduced into writing nor was it transmitted in accordance with the mandatory provisions of law.

10. Learned counsel further argues that although the prosecution claims to have associated an independent witness, namely Jagdish Kumar, at the time of recovery, the said witness has not been examined during trial. The non-examination of such a material witness, without any plausible explanation, creates a serious dent in the prosecution case. It is contended that the entire case rests solely on the testimonies of official witnesses, i.e., police officials, who are inherently interested in the success of the case and therefore, their testimonies ought to have been scrutinized with greater caution. It is also contended that mandatory procedural safeguards have not been complied with. In particular, it is submitted that Form No. 29 was not filled at the spot and the provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act were not adhered to, which vitiates the search and recovery. It is argued that the Trial Court has failed to consider these material lapses in their proper perspective.

11. Lastly, it is contended that there has been an unexplained delay in sending the samples to the office of the Chemical Examiner, thereby raising doubts regarding the sanctity and integrity of the sample allegedly recovered. In view of the aforesaid submissions, it is argued that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the prosecution version suffers from inherent contradictions and procedural

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

irregularities and thus, the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence be set aside and the appellant be acquitted of the charges.

12. On the other hand, the learned State counsel, while opposing the submissions advanced on behalf of the appellants, has argued that the appellants have been rightly convicted after due appreciation of the evidence on record. It is contended that the findings recorded by the learned Trial Court are based on cogent and reliable evidence and do not suffer from any illegality, perversity or infirmity warranting interference. It is further submitted that the prosecution has been able to establish the recovery of contraband from the conscious possession of the appellant through consistent testimonies of official witnesses. The mere fact that the witnesses are police officials does not render their evidence unreliable, particularly when their testimonies are found to be credible and have withstood the test of cross-examination. It is well settled that conviction can be sustained on the basis of official witnesses alone, in the absence of any material to suggest false implication.

13. Learned State Counsel further argues that the non-examination of the independent witness, Jagdish Kumar, is not fatal to the prosecution case. It is submitted that it is not uncommon for independent witnesses to abstain from appearing during trial and the prosecution case cannot be discarded solely on that ground when the remaining evidence is otherwise trustworthy and sufficient to establish guilt.

14. It is also contended that there has been substantial compliance with the statutory provisions under the NDPS Act. The appellant was duly apprised of his rights and the search and seizure were conducted with their

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

consent and in accordance with law. Any minor procedural irregularity, if at all, does not go to the root of the matter so as to vitiate the entire trial.

15. Learned State Counsel further submits that the delay in sending the sample to the Chemical Examiner does not affect the integrity of the sample, particularly when the seals were found intact and tallied at all stages. The chemical analysis report conclusively establishes that the substance recovered was contraband, thereby corroborating the prosecution case. Lastly, it is contended that the defence plea of false implication is bald and unsupported by any cogent material. No motive has been attributed to the police officials to falsely implicate the appellant. The prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt and the learned Trial Court has rightly returned a finding of conviction. In view of the aforesaid, it is prayed that the present appeal/revision petition be dismissed and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence be upheld.

16. I have heard learned counsel representing the parties and have gone through the case record.

17. At the outset it is apposite to refer to the findings recorded by the trial court, relevant extract whereof are as under:

“5. I have heard the learned Addl. PP for the State, Ld. defence counsel and have also gone through the record on the file carefully and the following point in this case is to be determined:

"Whether on 01.06.2005 at 4.00 p.m., in the area of village, Luhara, accused were found in possession of 30 kilograms of poppy husk without any permit of license

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

and whether they can be convicted?”

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

11. The first arguments advanced by the Id. counsel for the accused is that as per prosecution version, the I.O. received the secret information against the accused, but the same was not reduced into writing which is fatal to the prosecution case. I have heard this contention of the Id. counsel for the accused, but do not find any merits in the same as I may take support of case law titled as Satish Kumar alias Rishi Vs. State of Haryana 2009(3)RCR, (P&H), page 266, wherein it has been held:

*“C. Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, Section 42-Investigating Officer while on patrol duty received secret information regarding possession of contraband by accused. I.O. did not reduce the information in writing but effected recovery on the basis of said secret information. It is no violation of section 42-
Held:*

(1) Investigating officer is obligated to send such information to his immediate official superior only if the same has been taken down in writing- In the instant case secret information was not reduced to writing. That being so investigating Officer could not be expected to send the same to his immediate official superiors.

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

- (2) *Non-compliance of Section 42 does not ipso facto affect the conviction of the appellant unless it is shown that same has caused prejudice to him and resulted in failure of justice”.*

Further more, as per section 42 of the N.D.P.S. Act, it is obligation on the I.O. to send the information to his immediate superior official only if the same has been taken down in writing. In this case the case of the prosecution is not that the secret information was reduced into writing. So, merely fact secret information was not sent in writing to his superior by the I.O. in writing has not caused any prejudice to the accused. Further, HC Lakhwinder Singh, who was accompanying SI Gurbachan Singh, I.O. of the case has specifically deposed that after receiving the secret information, information regarding the same was given to the higher police officials by way telephonic message. So, the contention raised by the Id. counsel for the accused is having no force and the same is hereby repelled.

12. *Further, it was argued by the learned counsel for the accused that independent witness Jagdish Kumar was joined in the police party as per prosecution version, but he has not been examined by the prosecution during the trial, which casts*

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

doubt upon the prosecution case. I have heard this argument of the learned counsel for the accused, but do not find any weight in this arguments because statements of the officials witness cannot be discarded merely on the ground of colour of their office. The only analogy, which is to be kept in mind while relying upon the testimonies of the official witnesses is that there testimonies are to be scrutinized with more care and caution. Keeping in view this analogy in mind, I have scrutinized the testimonies of the official witnesses with more care and cautiously, which were subjected to lengthy cross-examination, but they could not be budged on any material aspect of the case of the prosecution. There is nothing on record to disbelieve the police officials and that they are truthful and credible. There is no reason for false implication. Further, I may take support of the case law titled as Mohan Singh Vs. State of Punjab, 2007(4) RCR (Criminal) (P&H), page 705, wherein, it has been held:

“C. Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, Section 15 - Evidentiary value of official witness - Recovery of 30 bags of poppy husks straw - Independent witness associated, but not examined - Not fatal to prosecution - There is no principle of law that without corroboration by independent witness, testimony of the official witness cannot be relied upon -In the instant recovery effected in presence of DSP a Gazetted officer-

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

no evidence that official witnesses were inimical towards the accused.

Further held:

That testimony Of official witnesses should be treated in the same manner as the testimony of any of the witness. The presumption that a person acts honestly applies as much in favour of a police personnel as of other persons and it is not a proper judicial approach to distrust and suspect them without good grounds.”

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

It is settled proposition of law that testimonies of the official witnesses are as good as of independent witnesses. Furthermore, the accused has not dared to summon the said independent witness Jagdish Kumar in his defense in order to falsify the case of the prosecution. On the other hand, the prosecution witnesses have remained unrebutted during their cross-examinations. So, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the accused is having no force and the same is hereby repelled.

13. Further, it was argued that seal was not handed over to an independent witness after use, which is also fatal to the prosecution case. I have heard this contention of the learned counsel for the accused, but I do not find any force in the same as it was held in case law titled as Parshan Singh son of Joginder Singh, R/o Village, Shahabad Vs. The State of

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

Haryana 2009(5) RCR(Criminal) (PSH), page 810, wherein, it has been held:

“D. Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances act, 1985, Section 15-Search and seizure-Seal after use handed over to ASI and not to an independent witness-Court has to take into consideration as to whether any prejudice caused to the accused on account of non-handing over the seal to an independent witness- Cogent, convincing, reliable and trustworthy evidence available on record - Non-entrustment of seal to an independent witness is of no consequence”.

In this case, the accused have failed to prove any prejudice has been caused to them on account of non-handing over the seal to the independent witness. Further, more as per Chemical Examiner's report, Ex.PW3/G, seals on the sample were intact and tallied with the specimen seal chit. So, contention raised by the learned counsel for the accused is having no force and the same is hereby repelled.

14. The next contention raised by ld. counsel for the accused was that CFL form was not filled up at the spot. I have heard this contention, but I do not find any merits in the same because PWI HC Lakhwinder Singh, recovery witness in his statement has specifically deposed that CFL form was filled up at the spot. Similarly, HC Nazar Singh another recovery witness has also deposed that CFL form was filled up at the spot. Further, I

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

may take support of case law titled as Wazir Singh Vs. State of Haryana 2010(1) RCR (Criminal) (P&H) , page 480, wherein, it has been held:

“B. Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Section 20(b) (i)(c)- recovery of contraband -CESL form not filled on spot-Held, there is no rule of evidence or procedural rule under Criminal Procedure code or N.D.P.S. Act that every document must be prepared at the spot of recovery”. Further, more as per report of the Chemical Examiner Ex.PW3/G, the seals of the sample were intact on arrival and agreed with the specimen seals. So, the possibility of tampering with is ruled out. So, in view of my above discussion and in the light of above citation of law, I do not find any force in the contention raised by the learned counsel for the accused and the same is hereby repelled.

15. Further, it was argued by the learned counsel for the accused that there are contradictions between the statements of the PWs. I have heard this contention of the learned counsel for the accused, but do not find any no force in this because in the present case, the recovery was made in the year, 2005 and the PWs of the case have deposed in the years, 2009 and 2010. It is settled proposition of law that with the passage of time, a true witness is not expected to narrate like a parrot as a true witness is not expected to be a tutored witness and minor discrepancies

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

and contradictions are bound to occur with the passage of time. In this case, the accused has failed to point out any major discrepancy or contradiction, which has caused any dent to the prosecution case, rather all the witnesses remained unrebutted during their cross- examinations and nothing fruitful came out to support the accused or to cause any dent to the case of the prosecution. So, in view of my above discussion, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the accused has no force and the same is hereby repelled.

16. On the other hand, the prosecution has examined HC Lakhwinder Singh as PW1, who has proved consent memos Ex. P1 and Ex. P2, recovery memo Ex. PW3, personal search memo Ex. P4 memo Ex. PS, grounds of arrest memo Ex. P6, Ex. P7 and representative sample parcel Ex.MO1.

17. The prosecution has Inspector Gurjant Singh as also examined PW5, who has entrustment memo Ex. PW3/D, application Ex. PW4/C, inventory report Ex. PW4/B, Court orders Ex. PW4/G, detailed report Ex. PW4/H, his endorsement Ex. PW5/A over the detailed report, report of the Chemical Examiner Ex. PW3/G, death certificate Ex. PA of SI Gurbachan singh, consent memos Ex.P1 and Ex. P2, recovery memo Ex. P3, ruqa Ex. PW3/B, memos of grounds of arrest Ex. P6 and Ex. P7, personal search memos Ex. P4 and Ex.P5, rough site plan Ex. PW3/F, specimen seal chit Ex.PW3/A and entrustment memo Ex. PW3/D.

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

18. *The prosecution has also examined HC Nazar Singh as PW3, who has proved the consent memo Ex. P1, another consent memo Ex. P2, recovery Memo Ex. P3, ruqa Ex. PW3/B, formal FIR Ex. PW3/C, personal search memo Ex. P4, Ex. P5, grounds of arrest memo Ex. P6, Ex. P7, recovery memo Ex. PW3/D, representative sample as Ex. M01, site plan Ex. PW3/E and report of the Chemical Examiner Ex. PW3/G.*

19. *The prosecution has also examined HC Surjit Singh as PW3 and C. Harpinder Singh as PW3, who tendered into evidence their affidavits Ex. PW4/A and Ex. P8, respectively and deposed about the fact of deposit of the case property/sample.*

20. *So, after considering the entire evidence placed on the record, law cited above, I am of the view that the prosecution has established beyond reasonable doubt that the accused were found in possession of 30 kilograms of poppy husk on 01.06.2005 at 4.00 p.m., in the area of village, Luhara without any permit or license and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 15 of the N.D.P.S. Act. Therefore, the presumption under sections 54 and 35 of the said Act is raised against them as the prosecution has proved unauthorized conscious possession of 30 kilograms of poppy husk from the accused and fully proved the recovery memo and report of the Chemical Examiner also remains unrebutted. On the other hand, the accused have not become able to cause any dent in*

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

the prosecution case, as discussed above. Further more, even the defence taken by the accused in their statements recorded under section 313 Cr.P.C., they have pleaded that they have been falsely implicated in the present case, but the reasons of their false implication have not been explained by them and have also failed to prove or allege that why the police officials were inimical towards them. So, the offence under section 15 of the N.D.P.S. Act is complete and the conviction must follow on the strength of statutory presumption. The accused have failed to rebut the presumption and they are held guilty of committing the offence under section 15 of the N.D.P.S. Act.”

18. A perusal of the above evidently shows that the Special court has given its thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and has perused the entire material available on record. The Court has specifically adverted to the objections raised by the appellant herein with regard to non-compliance of statutory provisions, including the non-reduction of secret information into writing, non-examination of the independent witness, non-handing over of the seal and delay or discrepancies in procedure. Each of these submissions has been dealt with in detail by placing reliance upon binding precedents and the Court has recorded cogent reasons as to why such objections do not vitiate the prosecution case in the absence of demonstrated prejudice to the accused. The reasoning reflects a correct appreciation of law that procedural lapses, unless shown to have caused miscarriage of justice, cannot be elevated to the level of fatal defects.

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

19. It is further evident that the Court has scrutinized the testimonies of the official witnesses and has found them to be consistent, reliable and worthy of credence. The Court has rightly observed that there exists no legal bar in relying upon the testimony of official witnesses merely on account of their official status, particularly when their evidence remains unshaken during cross-examination and is corroborated by documentary material, including recovery memos and the report of the Chemical Examiner. The Court has also taken into account the statutory presumptions arising under Sections 35 and 54 of the NDPS Act upon proof of conscious possession and has correctly shifted the onus upon the accused to rebut the same. The appellant, however, has failed to discharge this burden, either by leading cogent evidence or by eliciting material contradictions in the prosecution case. The plea of false implication has been found to be bald and unsupported by any plausible explanation or evidence.

20. In view of the above I am of the opinion that the impugned findings demonstrate that the Court has arrived at a well-reasoned conclusion that the prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt. No perversity, illegality or material irregularity is discernible in the approach or findings so recorded, which would warrant interference in revisional jurisdiction. Accordingly, the present appeals are dismissed.

21. At this stage, learned counsel for the appellant contends that his prayer only to the sentencing part be considered in view of the following mitigating circumstances:

- a. The incident in question pertains to the year 2005 and a period of more than 21 years has elapsed since the date of

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

the occurrence, thus diluting the immediacy and necessity of continued penal consequences.

- b. The appellant has faced the rigours and ordeal of a protracted trial spanning nearly two decades, which, in itself, has caused considerable mental and emotional hardship.
- c. The appellant-Balwinder Kumar in CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 has already undergone actual custody of 2 years 8 months and 24 days and appellant-Babu Singh in CRA-S-2083-SB-2012 has undergone actual custody of 1 year and 8 months, out of the total sentence of 3 years 6 months imposed upon them, which constitutes a substantial portion of the sentence.
- d. At the time of conviction, the appellant-Balwinder Kumar was approximately 34 years of age and as of now, he is around 49 years old, placing him at a mature and settled stage of life, where the objectives of reformation and rehabilitation would be better served by adopting a lenient and humane approach in the matter of sentencing.
- e. Similarly, at the time of conviction, appellant-Babu Singh was approximately 55 years of age and as of now, he is around 70 years old. The progression of time has thus placed him in the twilight years of his life, warranting a more humane and compassionate consideration in the matter of sentence.

365-1
365-2

CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)
CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

- f. The appellants have already undergone a substantial period of custody, which, coupled with the long lapse of time, satisfies the ends of justice.
- g. The object of the NDPS Act, though stringent, is not merely punitive but also reformatory, and in cases where the accused demonstrates long-term reformation, a lenient view is justified.
- h. The delay in conclusion of proceedings are not attributable to the petitioner and the long lapse of time coupled with the absence of criminal propensity deserves a reformatory and compassionate approach rather than a purely retributive one.

22. This Court, in CRR-2697-2025 titled *Lakshay Jain v. State of Punjab & Another*, vide order dated 14.11.2025, has held that sentencing must prioritise a reformatory approach, assessing an offender's background and circumstances rather than adopting a purely punitive stance. Mere involvement in an offence does not, by itself, establish criminality; instead, the totality of circumstances including the manner of the act, antecedents, conduct, and intent must guide sentencing. The law, therefore, distinguishes between errors of judgment and acts driven by deliberate mens rea, recognising that offenders are often capable of reform and should not be presumed beyond rehabilitation. The relevant extract of the aforesaid judgment are as follows:

32. The imposition of punishment is a refined judicial function that demands a careful harmonization of its underlying

purposes namely, retribution, deterrence, and reformation. This balance must reflect not only the reasoning of the Court but also the ethical standards and social context in which justice is administered. As societal values and circumstances evolve, the prominence accorded to each of these aims necessarily varies, requiring the Court to adapt its emphasis in response to the changing demands of justice. The aforesaid principle found early articulation in the writings of Justice Caldwell, who, in his authoritative work “Criminology,” observed that:

“If the infliction of pain is to have its greatest effect upon the behavior of a person, it must follow soon after the act for which it is given. But punishment always takes place weeks or even months after the offense has been committed, since the offender must first be apprehended, tried, and convicted. Such delay tends to disconnect the punishment from the offense in the mind of the offender, and it may well be considered as merely another painful experience in an unjust world.”

33. Moreover, Italian criminologist and jurist Cesare Beccaria, in his seminal treatise “On Crimes and Punishments,” propounded the doctrine of penal parsimony, emphasizing that the justification of any criminal justice system rests upon its capacity to inflict the least possible evil necessary to achieve its ends. The underlying premise is that punishment, being in itself a necessary evil and devoid of inherent virtue, must be confined

strictly within the bounds of necessity. The imposition of suffering or restriction upon an offender cannot extend beyond what is indispensable for the preservation of social order.

34. While 'retributive' object of sentencing is seen regressive, in modern day sentencing jurisprudence for its focus on punishing proportionally for the harm done and caters to the negative senses of spite and anger against a wrongful act, the rehabilitative/reformative approach examines the circumstances surrounding the offender on social, economical, physical and psychological level so as to reintegrate the offender in the social mainstream. The law extends the benefit of good and perceives a probability and possibility of reform. It aims at capitalising a perceived social liability. The expectation of law is based on the surrounding circumstances to distinguish between a 'criminal' and an 'offender'.

35. While the pre-requisites of crime do not distinguish two persons, on the legal scale, this aspect is significant for sentencing. A mere involvement of a person in crime may not necessarily mark a person as a 'criminal.' 'Criminality' in mind and action has to be determined from the totality of circumstances including the mode and manner in committing an offence, the conduct pre and post the offence, the criminal antecedents, nature of involvement, influence of peers etc. and not just from an isolatory consideration of commission of an offence. A Court of law would not assume every offender to be

365-1CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 (O&M)

365-2CRA_S-2083-SB-2012 (O&M)

beyond reform and differentiate in punishment on considering whether the offences arise due to human error or that stem from actions propelled by mens rea.

23. Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, including the inordinate lapse of more than 2 decades since the occurrence coupled with the fact that as against the substantive sentence of 03 years and 06 months, appellant-Balwinder Kumar in CRA-S-1725-SB-2011 has already undergone actual custody of 2 years 8 months and 24 days and appellant-Babu Singh in CRA-S-2083-SB-2012 has undergone actual custody of 1 year and 8 months, I deem it appropriate to partly allow the petition. While maintaining the judgment of conviction, the order of sentence so passed is modified. The sentence awarded vide order dated 12.03.2011 passed by the Judge, Special Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib, in Sessions case No.349 dated 20.10.2005 (RT No. 352 of 23.02.2007) arising out of FIR bearing No.202 dated 01.06.2005, registered under Sections 15 of the Narcotics & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Lambi, is modified to the period already undergone.

24. All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, are also ***disposed of.***

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

10.04.2026
Mangal singh

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No