



CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)

1

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

203

**CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)
Date of decision : 05.02.2026**

Baltej Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. H.P. Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 279, 337, and 338 of Indian Penal Code, the FIR No.31 dated 30.03.2004 was lodged in Police Station Kot Bhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib. 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 before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class Gidderbaha, hereinafter being referred to as 'trial Court' only.

2. The petitioner participated in the abovementioned trial, which by virtue of judgment dated 29.09.2009 culminated into his conviction.



CRR-3166-2012 (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	Fine	In default
1.	279 of IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months.	Rs.500/-	Rigorous imprisonment for 15 days
2.	337 of IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months.	Rs.300/-	Rigorous imprisonment for 15 days
3.	338 of IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year.	Rs.500/-	Rigorous imprisonment for 01 month

All the sentences were ordered to be run concurrently.

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 Sri Muktsar Sahib, 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 12.07.2012.

4. Feeling aggrieved of the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 29.09.2009, passed by the learned trial Court, and the judgment dated 12.07.2012, passed by the learned Appellate Court, the present revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner.

**CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)**

3

5. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Mukand Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 30.03.2004, he along with his son Mahinwal and brother Jaggar Singh had gone to see the cycle trick show to be done by a person in his Village, and after finishing the programme at about 10:30 pm, when he along with his son and brother returning home, Baltej Singh (petitioner herein) came on his tractor, being driven at a high speed, without any indication hit him, due to which his right leg was broken. According to complainant, after the incident, his son, brother and Nachhtar Singh, Panch got him admitted in Civil Hospital Sri Muktsar Sahib.

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 the trial of 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

**CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)**

4

meant for the commission of offence under Sections 279/337/338 of IPC were not established by the prosecution, up to 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 2004, 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 2012, 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 more than 21 years and has, in fact, already

**CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)**

5

suffered more punishment than he deserved. It has been further 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 of similar nature.

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 05 months. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of above-discussed factors the sentence already undergone by the petitioner may be treated to be sufficient.

13. *Per contra*, the learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner has been found guilty for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 279/337/338 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

**CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)**

6

interference or indulgence in the finding recorded by the learned trial Court with regard to conviction of petitioner for the offence under Sections 279/337/338 of 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 the 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. In view of abovementioned observations, the the sentence awarded to the petitioner, i.e. imprisonment for a period of one year, is held to be 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 21 years ago;
- (b) that the petitioner is facing the agony of protracted trial for the last 21 years; and
- (c) that there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner has been involved in any other criminal case of similar nature.



CRR-3166-2012 (O&M)

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. imprisonment for a period of 05 months and 21 days, 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

05.02.2026
Gaurav Thakur

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