



209

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-1232-2009
Date of Decision:24.03.2026

Randhir Singh and Anr. ...Petitioners
Vs.
State of Haryana ...Respondent

Coram : Hon’ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Chanakya Pandit, Advocate with
Ms. Lavanya Paul, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Parmod Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J.

1. The petitioners have filed the present revision petition against the impugned judgment dated 28.04.2009 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat and the impugned judgment of conviction dated 22.05.2008 and order of sentence dated 26.05.2008, passed by the Court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panipat, whereby the petitioners were ordered to be convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 323 and 324 r/w Section 34 of IPC and were sentenced as under:-

Under Section 323 IPC	R.I for a period of six months and to pay a fine of Rs.500, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo SI for a period of 01 month.
Under Section 324 IPC	R.I for a period of one year and to pay a fine of Rs.500, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo SI for a period of month.



2. The brief facts of the case are that on 13.06.2004, complainant Rattan Singh filed an application before the police to the following effect. That on 12.06.2004, his son was playing in the street alongwith other children and his slipper incidentally hit Randhir. Thereupon, Randhir had beaten up the son of the complainant. When the complainant was passing in front of the shop of Randhir, said Randhir alongwith his son Sunil came out of the shop and started abusing him. Randhir was armed with a "Bale" whereas Sunil had a bamboo stick and a knife. They started beating the complainant and caused injuries to the complainant through their respective weapons. Upon alarm raised by complainant, Bansi and Mohinder rescued him from the clutches of Randhir and Sunil. Requisite FIR No. 211 dated 13.06.2004 Police Station Model Town, Panipat was registered by police in this behalf. Complainant was medico legally examined. Statements of witnesses were recorded under section 161 of Code of Criminal Procedure. Both the appellants were arrested. After completing the investigations, the police filed the requisite challan against the appellants under sections 323/324/34 of Indian Penal Code.

3. After perusing the challan and accompanying documents, the Trial Court found that a prima facie case under Sections 323,324,34 of IPC was made out against the accused and they were charge-sheeted accordingly. However, the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried by the Trial Court.

4. In order to prove the charge against the accused, the prosecution examined 03 witnesses. PW-1 Dr. Jai Parkash, PW-2 Devender Kumar and PW-3 Rattan Singh and closed the prosecution evidence.

5. After the closure of the prosecution evidence, the statement of accused were recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C and all the incriminating



evidence was put to them, to which they pleaded that he had been falsely involved in the present case. No evidence in defence was led by the accused.

6. At the very outset, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that he does not wish to challenge the impugned judgments of conviction and some leniency may be shown by this Court, while awarding the sentence to them. Even though, learned counsel for the petitioners has not challenged the judgment of conviction, still this Court has considered the case on merits.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance, I have gone through the trial Court record carefully

8. In the present case, the prosecution examined PW-1 Dr. Jai Parkash, who medico-legally examined Rattan Singh, victim on 13.06.2004. He proved on record the medico-legal report as Ex.PW-1/A. PW-2 H.C Devender Kumar had investigated the matter and got the injured examined from Dr. Jai Parkash. He also explained steps taken by him, during the course of investigation. PW-3 Rattan Singh was the victim/injured in the present case and had narrated the sequence of events as mentioned in the FIR in the present case.

9. From the statements made by the aforesaid witnesses, it is apparent that the petitioner had caused simple injuries to PW-3 Rattan Singh and the said injuries were duly proved by PW-1 Dr. Jai Parkash. Both the Courts have rightly appreciated the evidence in the present case in the light of the settled cannons of law. Even, learned counsel for the petitioners have failed to point out any illegality or perversity in the impugned judgments of conviction passed by both the Courts, whereby, the petitioners were ordered to be convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 323 and 324 r/w Section 34 of IPC and



the same are ordered to be upheld.

10. Now, advertng to the order of sentence in the present case, this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the petitioners are facing the prosecution since 13.06.2004 i.e for the last more than 21 years. Even, both the petitioners have already undergone more than 02 months and 11 days of actual custody out of total sentence of 01 year. Even, sentence imposed on the petitioners were ordered to be suspended by this Court 03.07.2009 and in the past more than 15 years, they had been maintained good conduct. Thus, it would be appropriate to reduce the sentence imposed on the petitioners to the period already undergone by them in the present case. However, the amount of fine shall remain the same.

11. With the above modifications, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned judgment of convictions are upheld, whereas, the sentence imposed on the petitioners is reduced to the period already undergone by them and the amount of fine shall remain the same.

24.03.2026

hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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