



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

203

**CRR-2450-2008 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.01.2026**

Mohinder Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Rehan Gupta and Mr. Yajur Mago, Advocates
for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 304-A and 279 of the Indian Penal Code, the FIR No.24 dated 23.11.2001 was lodged in Police Station Shimlapuri, Ludhiana. Once the FIR was lodged, the investigation was taken up by the police, and as an outcome of abovesaid investigation, the petitioner was sent to face trial to the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class Ludhiana, hereinafter being referred to as 'trial Court'.

2. The petitioner participated in the abovementioned trial, which by virtue of judgment dated 09.03.2007 culminated into his conviction.

**CRR-2450-2008 (O&M)**

2

Thus, by virtue of order on quantum of sentence, on the same day, the petitioner was awarded following sentences:-

Sr. No.	Under Section	Imprisonment
1.	279 of IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months.
2.	304-A of IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year.

3. Aggrieved of the abovementioned judgment of conviction and order of sentence, the petitioner preferred an appeal in the Court of Sessions. The abovementioned appeal has been decided by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge (*Ad hoc*) Fast Track Court Ludhiana, hereinafter being referred to as 'Appellate Court' only. The appeal, preferred by the petitioner did not find favour before the learned Appellate Court, and the same has been dismissed by virtue of judgment dated 11.11.2008.

4. Feeling aggrieved of the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 09.03.2007, passed by the learned trial Court, and the judgment dated 11.11.2008, passed by the learned Appellate Court, the present revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner.

5. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on 23.11.2001 at the instance of 'Satwinder Singh'. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 22.11.2001 at around 04:00 pm, he and his father Gulzar Singh were going on their respective cycles to meet Bhagwan Singh, who was the friend of his father. It was further alleged by the complainant that when they reached near Aero



Cycle Gill Road his father was going ahead of him, and that there, a Punjab Roadways bus (Ludhiana Depot), bearing registration No.PB-12-8708, came from behind at a high speed. As per complainant, the bus was being driven in a rash and negligent manner and the abovementioned bus hit his father, due to which his father fell down on the road along with cycle and the blood started oozing out of his body. According to complainant, thereafter, the driver of the bus, whose name was Mohinder Singh, fled from the spot. The complainant further stated that in the meantime his acquaintance namely Jatinder Singh, arrived on the spot and they got his father admitted in CMC Hospital, where he passed away.

6. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned complaint formal FIR of this case was lodged, and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution during the course of investigation, when all the necessary formalities, with regard to investigation, were completed and the entire evidence was collected, the final report under Section 173 of Cr.P.C. was filed before the Court, for trial of the petitioner.

7. Heard.

8. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence deserve to be set aside, being the outcome of non-application of judicial mind. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned trial Court, vis-à-vis the learned Appellate Court, have failed to appreciate that the necessary ingredients meant for the commission of offence under Sections 279/304A of IPC were



not established by the prosecution, as per the standard required under the law.

9. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, merely, on the basis of conjectures and surmises as well as assumptions and presumptions, the learned trial Court held the petitioner guilty and that despite the facts that the deficiencies in prosecution case were pointed out, the abovementioned judgment of learned trial Court has been upheld by the learned Appellate Court.

10. However, during the course of arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that in the instant revision petition, the petitioner is not inclined to challenge the finding of conviction recorded by the learned trial Court, and duly affirmed by the learned Appellate Court. The learned counsel for the petitioner has categorically contended that at this stage, by virtue of present petition, the petitioner is only challenging the order on the quantum of sentence.

11. It has been further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the incident had taken place way back in the year 2001, and that on completion of trial, when the petitioner was convicted, he had preferred an appeal before the learned Appellate Court, which was decided in the year 2008, and in the same year, the present revision petition was filed. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is facing the agony of litigation for the last 25 years and has, in fact, already suffered more punishment than he deserved. It has been submitted on behalf of



petitioner that the offence in question is the first offence committed by the petitioner, and that even after the offence related to present revision petition, the petitioner has not been prosecuted for any other offence.

12. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that in the present case, the petitioner has already served a sentence for a period of more than 03 months, and that by treating the above-discussed factors, the sentence already undergone by the petitioner may be treated to be sufficient sentence.

13. *Per contra*, the learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner has been found guilty for the commission of offence punishable under Section 304A of IPC. According to learned State Counsel, the sentence awarded to the petitioner, i.e. imprisonment for a period of one year, is already on lower side, and that the petitioner is not entitled for a sentence of imprisonment for a period of less than one year. As per learned State Counsel, the instant revision petition has no merit and deserves dismissal.

14. The record has been perused carefully.

15. Once it is a categorical stand of the petitioner that he is not challenging the judgment of conviction, which has been duly affirmed by the learned Appellate Court, it is hereby held that there is no scope for interference or indulgence in the finding recorded by the learned trial Court



with regard to conviction of petitioner under Sections 279/304A IPC. Accordingly, the abovementioned finding is hereby affirmed.

16. As far as the order on quantum of sentence is concerned, in view of the fact that the petitioner is a first-time offender, and that after the present case, he has not been prosecuted by the police for any other case, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for a lenient view, and that the sentence awarded to the petitioner, i.e. imprisonment for a period of 01 year, is harsh. Thus, with regard to quantum of sentence, there is need for interference and indulgence of revisional jurisdiction of this Court.

17. In the light of above observations, if the factual matrix of present case is analyzed, it transpires that following are the points which need consideration:-

- (a) that the accident in question had taken place about 25 years ago;
- (b) that the petitioner is facing the agony of protracted trial for the last 25 years;
- (c) that there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner has been involved in any other criminal case; and
- (d) that the petitioner has already attained the age of 63 years.

18. As a cumulative effect of abovementioned observations, it is hereby held that in the present case the petitioner is entitled for a lenient view, and that the sentence, which he has already undergone in the present case, i.e. more than 03 months, is adequate to meet the ends of justice.



19. As a sequel to the aforesaid discussions, the present revision petition is hereby partly allowed. The judgment of conviction is upheld; but order on the point of quantum of sentence is modified, and the sentence awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him. The present revision petition stands partly allowed, accordingly.

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

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

20.01.2026
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No