

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

2026:PHHC:025392



205

CRR-2092-2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.02.2026

Vinod

...Petitioner.

Versus

Inderpal and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Ajit Sihag, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Mamli, Advocate for
Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate
for the respondents.

Sukhvinder Kaur, J.

The petitioner has challenged the judgment dated 09.08.2012 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, whereby the appeal preferred by respondents/ accused against the judgment of conviction dated 10.12.2009 and order of sentence dated 11.12.2009 passed by learned trial Court, was partly allowed while upholding the judgment of conviction dated 10.12.2009 and modifying the order of sentence dated 11.12.2009. The respondents were ordered to be released on probation on their furnishing bonds in the sum of Rs.20,000/- each with one surety in the like amount for a period of two years with an undertaking to keep peace and be

of good behaviour during the probation period.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 29.08.2003, on receiving information that injured Santosh had been admitted in Community Health Centra, Bhuna, the police officials reached there but the doctor declared the injured unfit to make statement. However, complainant Vinod Kumar, an eye witness made a statement alleging that on 29.08.2003 at about 3.00 P.M, when he along with his father Santosh was working in their fields, accused Rajender throttled him, accused Suresh and two other unknown persons beat him and his father. Accused Rajender gave a kassi blow on the head of his father. When they were being rescued by Radhey Sham, accused Inderpal and Shalender along with two unknown persons came there and inflicted lathi blows on them. On raising noise by him, they were rescued by neighbours. On the basis of the said statement, present FIR was registered. During investigation, rough site plan was prepared. Statements of witnesses under Section 161 Cr.P.C. were recorded. Accused were arrested. After completion of investigation, challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was presented before the Court.

3. In order to prove its case prosecution examined five witnesses. Statements of accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. were recorded, wherein all the incriminating evidence against accused was put to them.

4. On the basis of the evidence led on record the accused were held guilty and sentenced for commission of offence under Sections 323, 324, 325 read with Section 149 IPC, against which the respondents/ accused preferred an appeal which was partly allowed by learned Appellate Court in the manner narrated above.

5. Aggrieved against the judgment of granting of probation, the respondents/ accused have approached this Court by preferring the present revision petition.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that judgment of conviction 10.12.2009 and order of sentence dated 11.12.2009 had been passed by trial Court after properly appreciating the evidence on record and the respondents/ accused were rightly convicted and sentenced under Sections 323, 324, 325 read with Section 149 IPC.

7. On the other hand, the learned counsel for respondents has placed reliance on the judgments of this Court in **Rajinder Singh Versus State of Haryana & others passed in CRM-M-249-2013 dated 27.08.2018** to contend that once the probation period is over the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

8. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at length.

9. This Court in **Rajinder Singh Versus State of Haryana & others passed in CRM-M-249-2013 dated 27.08.2018**, held as under:-

“The judgment of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal is dated 27.10.2012, thus, respondent No.2 and 3 have already undergone sentence of probation imposed upon them and, therefore, no reason arises for me to go into the legality or propriety of the impugned judgment. The present petition stands disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.”

10. In the present case, the judgment of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad is dated 09.08.2012 and therefore, the respondents have already undergone the sentence of probation imposed

upon them. Therefore, there is no requirement for this Court to go into the legality or propriety of the impugned judgment.

11. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

18.02.2026.

komal

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