

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:062172



214

CRA-S-829-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.04.2026.

Ravi Kumar @ Kaka

...Appellant.

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Shiv C Bhola, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.

1. By way of this appeal, the appellant has challenged the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 13.01.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, vide which the appellant was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 1 ½ years along with fine of Rs.3,000/- for the offence punishable under Section 411 of IPC and in default of payment of fine to further undergo Rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month in case FIR No.81 dated 01.06.2012, under Sections 379, 411, 413, 420 IPC (Sections 473, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC added later on) registered at Police Station City South, Moga.

2. Today, the case was listed for hearing, only on the application for suspension of sentence i.e. CRM-14969-2026. However, on oral prayer made by learned counsel for the applicant-appellant, the main appeal i.e.

CRA-S-829-2026, which stands admitted vide order dated 12.03.2026

passed by this Court, is taken on board today itself for hearing.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the applicant-appellant has submitted that the judgment of conviction qua the applicant-appellant is not being assailed on merits and he restricts his prayer for modification of order on quantum of sentence.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent State submitted that he has no objection if the main appeal is taken up on board for hearing today itself. However, he contended that well-reasoned judgment has been passed by the Court below, based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record and the applicant-appellant does not deserve any leniency.

5. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard and the record has been meticulously examined with their able assistance.

6. Since the appellant has not challenged the judgment of conviction on merits, as such the said issues are not being gone into at this stage and it is being restricted to the issue pertaining to sentencing and quantum of punishment.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in **Pramod Kumar Mishra Vs. State of UP (2023) 9 SCC 810**, observed that punishment must not be viewed as an act of vengeance but as a means of reformation and reintegration of the offender into society. It was further held that an appropriate sentence must be determined by considering a range of factors, including the nature and circumstances of the offence, the offender's background, age, mental and emotional condition, potential for rehabilitation, prior criminal record, and the deterrent needs of the community. Sentencing, the Court noted, involves a delicate exercise of

judicial discretion where multiple social, psychological, and moral factors must be balanced to ensure that justice serves both societal protection and individual redemption.

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court again reiterated in **Ravada Sasikala v. State of AP reported as AIR 2017 SC 1166**, that 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. In order to determine the quantum of sentence, Courts should bear in mind the principle of proportionality as awarding punishment is not merely retributive but also reformative.

9. The perusal of impugned judgment reveals that there is no perversity and evidence on record has been appreciated in the right perspective, but as observed above, the counsel for the appellant has not challenged the conviction on substantive grounds and while limiting his plea solely to modification of the quantum of sentence to one already undergone.

10. Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the applicant-appellant, as per which the applicant-appellant has already undergone custody of 11 months and 15 days out of awarded substantive sentence of 1 ½ years.

11. Taking into consideration the facts noticed above that the appellant has faced the rigors of a long criminal prosecution; that he is the first time offender with no criminal antecedents, in the facts and

circumstances of the present case it would be in the interest of justice, if sentence awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

12. Therefore, in view of the discussion above, the present appeal is disposed of in the following terms :-

“The judgment of conviction dated 13.01.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga is upheld and order of sentence of the even date is modified to the extent that the sentence of the applicant-appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.”

13. With the above said observations, the appeal stands disposed of.

14. The concerned jail authorities are directed to release the appellant immediately, if not required in any other case.

15. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

16. The application bearing CRM-14969-2026 for suspension of sentence has been rendered infructuous as the sentence has been reduced to already undergone.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

23.04.2026.

Komal

Whether speaking/reasoned? : Yes/ No
Whether reportable? : Yes/ No