

2026.PHHC.063315



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

221

CRR 2531 of 2012

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

Ranjha Singh and another

...Petitioner (s)

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Sahil Khunger, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have filed the present revision petition against the impugned judgement dated 06.08.2012 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, and the judgement of conviction and order of sentence dated 15.03.2011 passed by the Court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ferozepur, whereby, the petitioners were held guilty for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 326, 323, 324, 148 and 149 of IPC and were sentenced as under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Name of Accused</i>	<i>Offence</i>	<i>R.I.</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>In Default</i>
1	Ranjha Singh	148 IPC	6 months	200/-	10 days
		326 IPC	2 years	1000/-	2 months
		324 IPC	1 year	500/-	1 month
		323 IPC	6 months	300/-	15 days
2	Bittu	148 IPC	6 months	200/-	10 days
		326/149 IPC	2 years	1000/-	2 months
		324 IPC	1 year	500/-	1 month
		323 IPC	6 months	300/-	15 days

2. The present case has been registered at the instance of Gurnam Singh, father of Usha Rani, injured on the allegations that on 21.02.2004 at about 08.00 p.m. he alongwith Usha Rani was planting trees outside his house when accused Kala Singh came there and stopped her from planting trees, as according to him, with the planting of the trees, passage to their house would be obstructed. But he told him that they would get the shadow of the tree under which they could sit in summer season. In the mean time son of Kala Singh namely Ranjha and his brother Darshan Singh, Bittu son of Darshan Singh also came there and they started abusing him and his daughters. Accused Veero Bai and Manjit Kaur also came there and started abusing them and they also raised *lalkara* that he be not spared on that day and be taught lesson. Thereafter, both these ladies accused dragged Usha Rani towards their house by holding her by her hairs. When he and his wife followed accused to get her released, accused Bittu gave *gandasi* blow on her left leg and then Ranjha gave blow with his *takua* on her right hand twice. Neck of Usha Rani was also pressed and kick and fist blows were also given to her. Motive behind this occurrence is that there is land dispute between the parties and due to that they have caused injuries to his daughter. The investigation of this was conducted by SI Chiranji Lal, who recorded statement of complainant, on the basis of which this case was got registered. After declaration of the injury No. 1 of injured Usha Rani, as grievous by the doctor, offence under section 326 IPC was added. Site plan of the place of occurrence Ex. PW4/B was prepared.

Accused were arrested and after completion of investigation, *challan* was presented in the court of Illaqa Magistrate.

3. After the presentation of *challan*, the petitioners were charge-sheeted for the offences punishable under Sections 326, 324, 323, 148 and 149 of IPC, to which, they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

4. In order to prove its case, the prosecution examined PW1 Gurnam Singh, PW2 Usha Rani, PW3 Dr. Balkar Singh, PW4 SI Charanji Lal and PW5 Mukhtiar Singh and thereafter evidence of the prosecution was closed by order.

5. After closure of the evidence, the statements of the petitioners were recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and they denied all the incriminating evidence put to them and stated that they have been falsely involved in the present case. No evidence was led in defence.

6. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he does not wish to challenge the judgement of conviction passed against the petitioners by the trial Court, however, some leniency may be shown while awarding the sentence on them. Even though, learned counsel for the petitioners has not challenged the judgements of convictions, still, this Court has considered the case on merits.

7. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioners do not deserve the concession regarding sentence and the present revision petition be dismissed.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

9. In the present case, the prosecution had examined PW1 Gurnam Singh, complainant, who had proved on record his statement, Ex. P1, which was the basis of the FIR. PW2 Usha Rani was an injured in the present case and had supported the case of the prosecution. The prosecution further examined PW3 Dr. Balkar Singh, who proved the MLR of Usha Rani as Ex. PW3/A, diagram Ex. PW3/B, X-ray report Ex. PW3/C and another report Ex. PW3/D. As per him, initially, the patient was unfit for making the statement. However, vide his endorsement dated 25.02.2004 Ex. PW3/L, he declared the patient unfit to make a statement. PW4, Chiranji Lal, IO, proved the entire investigation in the present case. He stated that after receiving the X-ray report Ex. PW4/E, the offence under Section 326 IPC was added. PW5 HC Mukhtiar Singh had conducted the personal search of accused Ranjha in the presence of SI Chiranji Lal and had attested the memos Ex. PW4/F and Ex. PW4/G and also proved the arrest memo as Ex. PW4/G. Even otherwise, I have carefully gone through the judgments passed by the learned trial Court and find that the same do not suffer from any infirmity, illegality, or perversity. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of convictions are ordered to be upheld.

10. Now adverting to the order on quantum of sentence, this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the is facing the agony of trial/appeal since 30.03.2011, i.e., for the last more than 15 years. The sentences imposed on the petitioners were suspended by this Court on 30.11.2009 and in the last more than 16 years, they have maintained good conduct and have not misused the concession of suspension of

sentence in any manner. Consequently, keeping in view the aforesaid mitigating circumstances, the sentence imposed on the petitioners are reduced to the period already undergone by them.

11. With the above modifications, the present revision petition is partly allowed and impugned judgement dated 06.08.2012 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, and the judgement of conviction and order of sentence dated 15.03.2011 passed by the Court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ferozepur, are upheld, whereas, the sentence imposed on the petitioners is reduced to the period already undergone by them. However, the sentence of fine will remain the same.

12. Pending applications, if any, stand also disposed of, accordingly.

21.04.2026	(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
amit rana	JUDGE
Whether reasoned/speaking	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No