

110

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



**CRR-1235-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.05.2026.**

Parveen

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Hayana

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Ms. Garima Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Singla, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this revision petition, the petitioner has challenged the judgment dated 16.04.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, whereby the appeal filed by the petitioner, challenging the judgment of conviction dated 23.01.2023 and order of sentence dated 25.01.2023 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Hisar, in case FIR No.887 dated 22.08.2015, under Sections 323, 324, 326, 341, 34 IPC and Section 25 (1)(B)(b) of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Hisar, was dismissed.

2. Brief facts of this case are that instant FIR was registered on the statement of Sham Sunder Saini, father of injured Bharat who stated that

he was running a cassette shop in video market, Hisar. On 22.08.2015, at around 8/8.30 a.m., he along with his son Bharat had gone to Mohalla Dhankan, Hisar, for some work. When they reached at the street behind Laxmibai, Dharamshala, accused Parveen, Sunny @ Shailu and Ravi stopped them on their way. Parveen and Ravi caught hold of his son Bharat and accused Sunny @ Shailu gave knife blows on the back and thigh of his son. When he raised alarm, Sanjay son of Nihal Singh and other residents of locality arrived at the spot and saved his son from the clutches of the assailants. All the accused fled away from the spot along with their weapons. He along with his brother Sanjay got Bharat admitted at Civil Hospital, Hisar and thereafter they took him to Sapra Hospital for further treatment. He prayed for strict legal action against the accused. Accordingly, the present FIR was got registered.

3 During investigation, ruqa and MLR of injured along with clothes were taken into police custody. Rough site plan was prepared. Statement of witnesses and opinion of doctor regarding nature of injuries sustained by Bharat, were obtained. Accused Sunny @ Shailu and Parveen were arrested. Accused Sunny got the knife recovered, which was used by him in the occurrence. On 15.09.2015, concerned doctor declared the injury suffered by injured to be grievous in nature and thereafter, Section 326 IPC was added. Accused Ravi was found to be innocent during investigation and after completion of investigation, charge sheet was filed against accused Parveen and Sunny @ Shailu.

4 Upon trial, vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 25.01.2023 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Hisar,

the petitioner was convicted and sentenced as under:-

Under Section	Sentence
326 read with Section 34 IPC	SI for two years and fine of Rs.2,000/-. In default of payment of fine, SI for two months.
324 read with Section 34 IPC	SI for one year.
341 read with Section 34 IPC	SI for one month.

5. Aggrieved against the same, the petitioner preferred appeal before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, but the same was dismissed vide order dated 16.04.2026.
6. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the aforesaid judgment of conviction of the petitioner is not being assailed on merits and he restricts his prayer for modification of order on quantum of sentence.
7. Per contra, learned counsel for the state submitted that the well reasoned judgment has been passed based on correct appreciation of the evidence available on record and the petitioner does not deserve any leniency.
8. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard and the record has been meticulously examined with their able assistance.
9. Since the revisionist/ petitioner has not challenged the judgment of conviction on merits, as such the said issues are not being gone into at this stage and the prayer is restricted to the issue pertaining to sentencing and quantum of punishment.
10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Pramod Kumar Mishra Vs. State of UP (2023) 9 SCC 810, observed that punishment must not be viewed as an act of vengeance but as a means of reformation and reintegration of the offender into society. It was further held that an appropriate sentence must

be determined by considering a range of factors, including the nature and circumstances of the offence, the offender's background, age, mental and emotional condition, potential for rehabilitation, prior criminal record, and the deterrent needs of the community. Sentencing, the Court noted, involves a delicate exercise of judicial discretion where multiple social, psychological, and moral factors must be balanced to ensure that justice serves both societal protection and individual redemption.

11. Hon'ble Supreme Court again reiterated in *Ravada Sasikala v. State of AP reported as AIR 2017 SC 1166*, that law in this regard is well settled that opportunities of reformation must be granted and such discretion is to be exercised by evaluating all attending circumstances of each case by noticing the nature of the crime, the manner in which the crime was committed and the conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused. In order to determine the quantum of sentence, Courts should bear in mind the principle of proportionality as awarding punishment is not merely retributive but also reformative.

12. The perusal of impugned judgment reveals that there is no perversity and evidence on record has been appreciated in the right perspective, but as observed above, the counsel for the petitioner has not challenged the conviction on substantive grounds while limiting his plea solely to modification of the quantum of sentence to one already undergone.

13. Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 07.05.2026 of the petitioner, as per which the petitioner has already undergone custody of 01 year, 05 months and 12 days out of awarded substantive sentence of 02 years.

14. Taking into consideration the facts noticed above that the petitioner has faced the rigors of a long criminal prosecution; in the facts and circumstances of the present case it would be in the interest of justice, if sentence awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

15. Therefore, in view of the discussion above, the judgment dated 16.04.2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, is upheld with modification to the extent that the sentence of the petitioner is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

16. Disposed of.

17. The concerned jail authorities are directed to release the petitioner immediately, if not required in any other case.

18. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

19. Registry is directed to do the needful.

08.05.2026
jyoti3

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

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