

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:039543



(202)

(1)

CRR-676-2010 (O&M)

Umarjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

(2)

CRR-2495-2010 (O&M)

Indervir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

Decided on: 13.03.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI

Present:- Mr.C.L.Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-676-2010.

Ms.Monika Jalota, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-2495-2010.

Mr.Akhil Kamra, AAG, Punjab.

RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI, J. (Oral) :

1. In consequence to an FIR No.76 dated 17.05.2000 registered at Police Station Dhanaula against the petitioners, they were tried by the concerned Judicial Magistrate. On conclusion of trial, the petitioner Indervir Singh was convicted under Section 382 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for brevity, "1860 Code") and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (for brevity, "1959 Act") whereas the petitioner Umarjit Singh was convicted under Section 382 of the said Code. Through a judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 01.02.2005, both were imposed

rigorous imprisonment of 2 years and a fine of Rs.1000/- under Section 382 of the said Code whereas the petitioner Indervir Singh was also sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and a fine of Rs.500/- under Section 25 of the 1959 Act. Default sentences were also imposed on them.

2. Aggrieved of the said conviction and sentence, they filed a Criminal Appeal before the Sessions Court at Barnala. However, it was dismissed on 01.02.2010. Aggrieved of the said conviction etc., the petitioners have filed the present petitions. Same were admitted by this Court and sentences imposed on them were ordered to be suspended. They are now stated to be on bail.

3. I have heard Shri C.L.Verma, Advocate for the petitioner Umarjit Singh and Ms.Monika Jalota, Advocate for the petitioner Indervir Singh as well as Shri Akhil Kamra, AAG, Punjab, on merits of the Revision Petitions. With their assistance, I have perused photocopies of the record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have made statements at Bar that they do not challenge the judgments of conviction passed against their clients but leniency may be shown to the petitioners in respect of imposition of sentences. Shri Verma states that his client has already undergone a period of 5 months and 10 days out of the sentence of 2 years whereas Ms.Jalota states that her client has already undergone more than 1 year and 3 months out of 2 years of imprisonment imposed on him. They also state that their respective clients have already deposited the imposed fine.

5. In support of their plea for reduction of sentence, they state that a perusal of the judgment dated 01.02.2005 passed by the concerned Judicial Magistrate shows that 22 injuries were detected on person of the petitioner Indervir Singh in his medico-legal examination conducted on 18.05.2000 whereas 17 injuries were detected on person of the petitioner Umarjit Singh in his medico-legal examination conducted on that date. They in fact argue that such injuries have been deposed by DW1 Paramjit Singh to have been caused by the police persons in civil dress. As per them, the said injuries were not explained by the prosecution. They also state that there is no other criminal case/FIR against the petitioners registered at any place. Lapse of a period of more than 25 years since the date of the occurrence is also pleaded to be a ground for reduction of sentence in addition to the fact that at the time of occurrence in question, the petitioners were young boys of 22/23 years of age.

6. On the other hand, Learned AAG, Punjab has opposed prayer for reduction of sentence of the petitioners. However, upon a query raised to him, he could not satisfactorily reply presence of the above-mentioned injuries upon persons of the petitioners when they were medico-legally examined on 18.05.2000. He however admits that the petitioners have already undergone the above-stated periods of custody after their conviction in the matter in question.

7. On such hearing and perusal, the impugned judgments of conviction passed against the petitioners are confirmed. However, for what has been argued on behalf of the petitioners in support of prayer for reduction of sentence and in the facts/circumstances of the present matter

especially when the petitioner Umarvir Singh has undergone a period of 5 months and 10 days out of imprisonment of 2 years whereas the petitioner Indervir Singh has undergone more than 1 year and 3 months out of 2 years of imprisonment imposed on him coupled with the fact that they have already deposited the imposed fine and they are not stated to have committed any crime while being on bail, I deem it a fit case for reduction of sentence imposed on the petitioners. Accordingly, the sentences imposed on the petitioners are ordered to be reduced to the period already undergone by them. Sentence of fine, including default sentence, however, are maintained.

8. Both the petitions are partly allowed in the above-stated terms. All interim application(s), if any, also stand disposed of. A copy of this order be placed on the record of CRR-2495-2010.

13.03.2026
Sailesh

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	
Whether Reportable :	No	