



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-653-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.03.2026

RAJ KUMAR AND ORS.

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Aman Pal, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Neha Rani, Advocate
Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG Haryana.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant revision petition has been filed challenging the judgment dated 23.02.2026, passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra (hereinafter referred to as 'learned trial Court') in Sessions case CRA No.132 of 2018, titled as '*Raj Kumar & Ors. vs. State of Haryana*', whereby the appeal filed by the petitioners was dismissed and the judgment of conviction dated 16.03.2018 and the order of sentence dated 17.03.2018 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kurukshetra was upheld in case arising out of FIR No. 739 dated 15.11.2012, registered under Sections 323, 341, 506, 34 IPC at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners submits

that he is not challenging the sentence and confines his prayer that the



revision be considered for extending the benefit of probation to the petitioners considering prolonged trial and no criminal antecedents post conviction in the present FIR.

3. Since the learned counsel is not challenging the impugned judgment passed by the Court below on its merit and seeking benefit of probation, the sole consideration before this Court is as to whether the prayer made learned counsel for the petitioners for extending benefit of probation can be accepted or not?

4. Before proceeding to consider the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners for release of the accused persons on probation, it is apposite to refer to the legal position on the subject. The aims and objectives of the Probation of Offenders Act were authoritatively laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jugal Kishore Prasad v. State of Bihar, AIR 1972 SC 2522***. Hon'ble Supreme Court while considering the scope of the Probation Act had held as under:-

"The Probation of Offenders Act was enacted in 1958 with a view to provide for the release of offenders of certain categories on probation or after due admonition and for matters connected therewith. The object of the Act is to prevent the conversion of youthful offenders into obdurate criminals as a result of their association with hardened criminals of mature age in case the youthful offenders are sentenced to undergo imprisonment in jail. The above object is in consequence with the present trend in the field of penology, according to which effort should be made to bring about correction and reformation of the individual offenders and not to resort to retributive justice. Modern criminal jurisprudence recognizes that no one is a born criminal and that a good



many crimes are the product of socio-economic milieu. Although not much can be done for hardened criminals, considerable stress has been laid on bringing about reform of young offenders not guilty of very serious offences and of preventing their association with hardened criminals."

5. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Isher Das v. State of Punjab, AIR 1972 Supreme Court 1295*** and ***Arvind Mohan Sinha v. Amulya Kumar Biswas and others, 1974 AIR (SC) 1818***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court had taken the similar view. Relevant paragraph of ***Arvind Mohan Sinha's*** case (supra) reads as under:-

"The Probation of Offenders Act is a reformatory measure and its object is to reclaim amateur offenders who, if spared the indignity of incarceration, can be usefully rehabilitated in society. A jail term should normally be enough to wipe out the stain of guilt but the sentence which the society passes on convicts is relentless. The ignominy commonly associated with a jail term and the social stigma which attached to convicts often render the remedy worse than the disease and the year purposes of punishment stands in the danger of being frustrated. In recalcitrant cases punishment has to be deterrent so that others similarly minded may warn themselves of the hazards of taking to a career of crime. But the novice who strays into the path of crime ought, in the interest of society, be treated as being socially sick. Crimes are not always rooted in criminal tendencies and their origin may lie in psychological factors induced by hunger, want and poverty. The Probation of Offenders Act recognises the importance of environmental influence in the commission of crimes and prescribes a remedy whereby the offender can be reformed and rehabilitated in society. An attitude of social defiance and



recklessness which comes to a convict who, after a jail term, is apt to think that he has no more to lose or fear may breed a litter of crime. The object of the Probation of Offenders Act is to nip that attitude in the bud. Winifred A Sikin describes probation as a system which provides a means of re-education without the necessity of breaking up the offender's normal life and removing him from the natural surroundings of his home. (English Juvenile Courts (1938) page 162) Edwin R. Sutherland raises it to a status of a convicted offender. (Principles of Criminology, 4th Edn. (1947) page 383)."

6. The primary objective of probation laws is to provide an opportunity for reformation to offenders who are not habitual or hardened criminals, but who have committed offences under momentary weakness or due to compelling circumstances. Such provisions aim to prevent the stigma and adverse influence of incarceration, while also addressing the issue of prison overcrowding. Section 360 Cr.P.C. empowers the Court to release an accused on probation of good conduct or after admonition. Section 361 Cr.P.C. mandates that if the Court chooses not to extend such benefit, despite its applicability, it must record special reasons in the judgment.

7. A conjoint reading of the Probation of Offenders Act reveals that Section 4, by virtue of its non-obstante clause, has overriding effect. Where the conditions stipulated therein are satisfied, the Court is vested with ample discretion to release a first-time offender of a minor offence on probation, considering the nature of the offence, age, antecedents, and surrounding circumstances, in lieu of sentencing him to imprisonment.



8. Now adverting to the facts of the present revision, the petitioners have been held guilty by the learned trial Court for commission of offences punishable under Section 148 read with Section 149, Section 341 read with Section 149 IPC and Section 323 read with Section 149 IPC. The petitioners had then filed an appeal before the Court of learned Sessions Judge which was subsequently upheld. The petitioners have faced the agony of trial for the last 14 years. Much water has flown since then. The petitioners are having no criminal antecedents. Further, the petitioners have never misused the concession of bail granted to them and have prayed for release on probation. The petitioners namely Prashant, Rampal and Vishwajeet have already undergone substantive sentence of 18 days and petitioners namely Raj Kumar and Kamaljeet have already undergone substantive sentence of 21 days and have no criminal antecedents post conviction in the present case.

9. Therefore, in totality of facts after taking into consideration the agony and trauma faced by the petitioners during protracted trial, appeal, their antecedents, nature of offence and other emanating circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners behind bars to serve the remaining sentence.

10. Accordingly, it is directed that the petitioners shall be released on probation, subject to their furnishing necessary surety bonds/bail bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM within a period of one month from the date of this order. The release shall



of good behaviour for a period of two years from the date of this order. The petitioners shall also disclose their current residential address and contact number before the learned Trial Court by way of an affidavit at the time of furnishing the bonds. It is further made clear that in the event the petitioners are found to be involved in any unlawful activity during the probation period, the sentence imposed by the learned Trial Court shall automatically stand revived.

11. As such, the instant appeal is hereby dismissed on merits and the impugned judgment is upheld. However, the order of sentence is accordingly modified to the extent and in the manner depicted herein above.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

11.03.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |