

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:074272



204

CRA-S-3715-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.05.2026.

Manjit Singh @ Sunny

...Appellant.

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate and
Mr. G.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.

By way of this appeal, the appellant has challenged the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 18.11.2025 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur, vide which the appellant was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 03 years along with fine of Rs.30,000/- for the offence punishable under Section 22(b) of NDPS Act and in default of payment of fine to further undergo imprisonment for a period of 03 months, in case FIR No.130 dated 25.08.2018, under Section 22 of NDPS Act registered at Police Station Chhajli.

2. Today, the case was listed for hearing, only on the application for suspension of sentence i.e. CRM-17607-2026. However, on oral prayer made by learned counsel for the applicant-appellant, the main appeal i.e.

CRA-S-3715-2025, which stands admitted vide order dated 01.12.2025

passed by this Court, is taken on board today itself for hearing.

2. Brief facts of this case are that the aforesaid FIR was registered against the appellant when he was apprehended by the police officials and 40 strips of tablets mark Tramadol Hydrochloride 100 mg Clovidol 100 SR and each strip containing 10/10 tablets i.e. 400 tablets were recovered from him, which falls in intermediate quantity. He failed to produce any license regarding the conscious possession of the same. The investigation was completed and challan was presented. After trial, the appellant was convicted and sentenced as stated above by the trial Court, hence this appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging his conviction and sentence.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that he does not want to challenge the conviction of the appellant on merits but as far as sentence part is concerned, he prays that the same may be reduced to that of already undergone by the appellant. He has submitted that the FIR in present case pertains to the year 2018 and the appellant has already undergone the actual sentence of 06 months and 23 days of the total awarded sentence of three years by the trial Court. He has submitted that as such a lenient view be taken and the sentence awarded be reduced to that of already undergone.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent State submitted that well-reasoned judgment has been passed by the Court below, based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record and the applicant-appellant does 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. Since the appellant has not challenged the judgment of

conviction on merits, as such the said issues are not being gone into at this stage and it is being restricted to the issue pertaining to sentencing and quantum of punishment.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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 appellant has not challenged the conviction on substantive grounds and while limiting his plea solely to modification of the quantum of sentence to one already undergone.

10. Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the applicant-appellant, as per which the applicant-appellant has already undergone custody of 06 months and 23 days out of awarded substantive sentence of three years.

11. The recovery of 162.8 gms Tramadol hydrochloride salt found in 400 tablets, from the appellant in the present case falls within the intermediate quantity.

12. Taking into consideration the facts noticed above that the appellant 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 appellant is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

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

“The judgment of conviction dated 18.11.2025 passed by learned Special Judge, Sangrur is upheld and order of sentence of the even date is modified to the extent that the sentence of the applicant-appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.”

14. With the above said observations, the appeal stands disposed of.

15. The concerned jail authorities are directed to release the appellant immediately, if not required in any other case.
16. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

12.05.2026.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)

JUDGE

Komal

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Whether reportable?

:

:

Yes/ No

Yes/ No