

2026.PHHC.025955



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

272

**CRR-804-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.02.2026**

xxxxxxx

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed by the petitioner, who was a juvenile in conflict with law at the time of alleged incident, against the judgment of conviction and order of detention, both dated 30.10.2018, passed by the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Ferozepur (*for short 'Board'*) in case arising out of FIR No. 05 dated 13.01.2015, registered under Section 304 of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Ferozepur Cantt, whereby he was held guilty for commission of offence punishable under Section 304-A of IPC and was directed to undergo detention for a period of two years. The petitioner has also laid challenge to the judgment dated 18.02.2025, passed by the learned appellate Court, whereby the appeal filed by him had been dismissed.

2. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner has made a statement so as not to press the present revision against the judgment passed by the Board holding him guilty for commission of offence punishable under Section 304-A of IPC as well as against the judgment passed by the learned appellate Court. Learned counsel confines his prayer against the order of detention passed by the Board, whereby the petitioner was directed to undergo detention for a period of two years.

2026.PHHC.025955



It is further submitted that petitioner is not the previous convicts nor any other case is pending against him. He was a juvenile at the time of occurrence. He has already undergone substantive period of his detention. So, looking into these circumstances, the detention period of the petitioner may be reduced to the period already undergone by him.

3. Learned State Counsel has no serious objection to the aforesaid prayer. He has filed custody certificates, as per which, the petitioner has already undergone actual detention of more than one year awarded by the Board and upheld by the learned appellate Court and he is not involved in any other case.

4. After hearing the counsel for the parties, I uphold the judgments passed by the Board as well as by learned appellate Court as the same are based on appreciation of prosecution evidence, proving guilt of the petitioner, however, considering the fact that the petitioner has faced the agony of protracted trial, he was juvenile at the time of occurrence and has already undergone actual detention of more than one year out of the period of two years and subsequently is not involved in any other case, which shows that he has improved his character, the order dated 30.10.2018, directing him to undergo detention for a period of two years, is modified to the extent that the same is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

5. The petitioner is directed to be released from custody/detention forthwith, if not required in any other case.

6. The petition stands disposed of. Pending application, if any, shall also be treated as disposed of.

18.02.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No