

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

2026:PHHC:019914



104

CRR-596-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.02.2026

Lal Chand

...Petitioner.

Versus

Ram Sarup and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Ankit Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

Sukhvinder Kaur, J.

The petitioner has challenged the judgment dated 22.11.2016 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, whereby the appeal preferred by respondents No.1 to 5/ accused against the judgment of conviction dated 06.01.2015 and order of sentence dated 07.01.2015 passed by learned trial Court, was partly allowed while holding the judgment of conviction dated 06.01.2015 and setting aside the order of sentence dated 07.01.2015. The respondents No.1 to 5 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 one year with an undertaking to

keep peace and be of good behaviour during the probation period.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the appellant/ complainant filed a complaint before the trial Court with the allegations that on 16.06.2010 at about 11:00 A.M., when he reached home from the fields, he saw Pista, Nirmala, Asha quarreling with his wife and Bhabhi (sister-in-law). When he tried to rescue them, respondents No.1 to 5/ accused entered his house and accused Sunil gave an iron rod blow on his head, accused Ram Sarup gave a lathi blow on his left knee, accused Krishan gave danda blow on his right thigh and accused Harish gave danda blow on his left thigh. Roshni and Kanta Devi and other neighbours rescued the complainant. However, accused threatened the complainant with death. After that the complainant was admitted in the hospital, where police recorded his statement and lodged proceedings under Section 107/ 151 Cr.P.C.

3. On the basis of the preliminary evidence, accused were summoned and after pre-charge evidence they were charge sheeted and after trial, they were convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of six months for commission of offence under Section 323 read with Section 149 IPC and to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- each for commission of offence under Section 148 IPC and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 10 days each.

4. Against the judgment of conviction dated 06.01.2015 and order of sentence dated 07.01.2015, 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 petitioners submits on the basis of the evidence available on record, the respondents No.1 to 5/ accused were rightly convicted by the trial Court and they were not entitled to the benefit of probation accorded to them by the trial Court.

7. On the other hand, the learned counsel for respondents has placed reliance on the judgment 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, Hisar is dated 22.11.2016 and therefore, respondents No.1 to 5 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

10.02.2026.

komal

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