



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-33168-2025
in/and CRA-S-2525-2025
Date of decision: 26.02.2026

RANUP ALIAS ANUP AND ANOTHER

....Appellants

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Rituraj Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-33168-2025

1. The applicant/appellants has filed the present application under Section 430 read with Section 528 of B.N.S.S, for suspension of sentence awarded to them, during the pendency of the appeal.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants seeks permission to withdraw the present application and further prays that the main case be taken up for hearing today itself.

3. Considering the oral request made by learned counsel, the prayer is allowed. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed as withdrawn, and the main case, i.e. CRA-S-2525-2025, is taken on board and heard today itself.

Main case

1. This appeal is filed against the judgment dated 28.07.2025 and order of quantum of sentence dated 31.07.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat, in case FIR No.164 dated 22.04.2019 under Sections 395, 397 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Ganaur, Sonapat.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on on 22.04.2019, ASI Virender Singh along with other police officials was present at the place of occurrence in connection with case FIR No.163 dated 22.04.2019, registered under Sections 379B, 34 IPC and 25-54-59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Ganaur. He received telephonic information regarding a robbery at Punjab National Bank, Panchi Gujran. On reaching the spot, the Bank Manager, Mahender Singh, informed the police that at about 2:30 PM, five young boys arrived on two motorcycles, armed with weapons and with their faces covered. They entered the bank, threatened the staff, and at gunpoint looted ₹6,88,650/- from the safe and the cashier's cabin. Thereafter, they locked the Manager and other staff members in the strong room and fled from the spot along with the bank's DVR. During the investigation, the petitioners were arrested, their disclosure statements were recorded, weapons of offence and stolen cash were recovered, and the place of occurrence was identified at their instance. After completing the investigation, the petitioners were challaned for the aforesaid offences. Upon trial, vide judgment dated 28.07.2025 and order of quantum of sentence dated 31.07.2025, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge,

Sonapat, appellants were convicted and sentenced as under:-



Name of convicts	Sentence under Section	RI awarded	Fine	In default of payment of Fine further RI for
Ranup @ Anup and Satbir @ Sonu	395 IPC	05 years	10,000/-	06 months
Satbir @ Sonu	25 Arms Act	02 years	5,000/-	02 months

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that appellant No.2 has already completed his sentence and has been released from jail. Hence, he withdraws the present appeal qua appellant No.2. He further submits that he is not assailing the conviction of the appellant No.1 on merits and restricts his prayer qua modification of the order on quantum of sentence, to that of the sentence already undergone by the appellant No.1, as he has already undergone total sentence of 03 years 09 months and 27 days.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate in Court today, which is taken on record and opposes the prayer of the appellant No.1 on the ground that learned trial Court has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record and as such, they do not deserve any leniency.

5. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard, and the record has been meticulously examined with their able assistance.

6. In *Deo Narain Mandal v. State of U.P. (2004) 7 SCC 257*, the Supreme Court (Three-Judge Bench) underscored that sentencing is not a mere formality in criminal proceedings. Where a statute prescribes both minimum and maximum terms, the court must exercise the discretion



the gravity of the offence, manner of commission, and the accused's age are imperative in determining an appropriate sentence. The sentencing court must operate within the principle of proportionality, ensuring the sentence is neither unduly harsh nor inappropriately lenient.

7. In *Ravada Sasikala v. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 2017 SC 1166*, the Court reaffirmed that sentencing serves a broader social purpose a deterrent effect that compels the offender to acknowledge the harm caused both to the victim and to society. The Court held that opportunities for reformation must be afforded, and sentencing discretion must be exercised by weighing all attendant circumstances, including the nature and manner of the offence and the conduct of the accused, to strike a balance between legal efficacy and prospects of rehabilitation.

8. A careful review of the conviction rendered by the learned trial Court reveals no perversity; the decision is grounded on a sound appreciation of the evidence. Counsel for the appellants has not challenged the conviction on substantive grounds, limiting his plea solely to a modification of the quantum of sentence to one already undergone.

9. Perusal of record indicates that FIR(supra) was registered in the year 2019 and the appellant No.1 has been suffering the agony of trial since the last more than 06 years. As per the custody certificate, he has already undergone the total sentence of 03 years 09 months and 27 days out of substantial sentence of 05 years awarded to him.

10. Accordingly, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to the appellants is reduced



11. Therefore, in view of the discussion above, the present appeal is disposed of in the following terms:-

- (i) The judgment dated 28.07.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat is upheld.
- (ii) The order of sentence dated 31.07.2025 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 05 years awarded to the appellant No.1 is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.
- (iii) The present appeal qua appellant No.2 is dismissed as withdrawn as having been rendered infructuous.

12. The jail authorities are directed to release the appellant No.1 immediately, if not required in any other case.

13. Registry is directed to do the needful.

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

26.02.2026
Mohit Bishnoi

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |