



**1133 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRA-S-2154-SB-2008
Date of decision: 06.05.2025

Manohar SinghAppellant

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Devanshi Sharma, Advocate (*Amicus Curiae*)
for the appellant.

Mr. Harkesh Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer in the present appeal is to set aside the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 05.11.2008 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Barnala, whereby, the appellant was convicted and sentenced for the offence punishable under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter 'NDPS Act'), in the case stemming from FIR No.02 dated 05.01.2007, under Section 15 of the NDPS Act at Police Station City Barnala.

2. The appellant was convicted for keeping in possession 8 kg of poppy husk and sentenced as mentioned below:

Offence	Sentence
Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months and to pay fine of Rs.500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month.

3. Learned *amicus curiae* for the appellant *inter alia* contends that there are various flaws in the case of the prosecution and the alleged recovery made from the appellant is doubtful. One Geja Singh associated as independent



CRA-S-2154-SB-2008


-2-

witness at the time of recovery, has not been examined by the trial Court. The entire case of the prosecution hinges upon the testimony of the official witnesses. Further, the alleged recovery was effected on 05.01.2007, however, the representative sample was sent after a delay of ten days i.e. on 16.01.2007. There are shortcomings and discrepancies in the testimony of the official witnesses. Lastly, counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has already undergone an actual period of 02 months and 04 days in custody.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the appellant as the learned Court below has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. He further submits that the appellant is a habitual offender and is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act and as such, he does not deserve any leniency.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the appellant was convicted for being in possession of 08 kg of poppy husk, i.e. intermediate quantity, attracting the offence of Section 15 of NDPS Act, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per his custody certificate, appellant has already undergone an actual period of 02 months and 04 days out of total sentence of 06 months, in the instant case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section 15 NDPS Act, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

6. Further, the primary consideration in matters where the petitioner/appellant is involved in other NDPS cases ought to be the severity of the offence. Moreover, Co-ordinate benches of this Court have deemed it appropriate



to reduce the sentence imposed upon the accused to be the custody already undergone by them, in spite of their involvement in other cases pertaining to the NDPS Act in *Pritam Singh @ Preeti vs. State of Punjab* in **CRA-S-1769-SB-2010** decided on 03.04.2025, **Ram Lal vs. State of Haryana** in **CRA-S-986-SB-2005** decided on 11.05.2018, *Raj Pal vs. State of Haryana* in **CRA-S-68-SB-2005** decided on 28.04.2023, **Raj Pal vs. State of Haryana** in **CRA-S-34-SB-2005** decided on 28.04.2023 and *Gurmail Singh and others vs. State of Punjab* in **CRA-S-1976-SB-2007** decided on 28.03.2025.

7. In ***Deo Narain Mandal vs. State of U.P. (2004) 7 SCC 257***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has opined that awarding of sentence is not a mere formality in criminal cases. When a minimum and maximum term is prescribed by the statute with regard to the period of sentence, a discretionary element is vested in the Court. Background of each case, which includes factors like gravity of the offence, manner in which the offence is committed, age of the accused, should be considered while determining the quantum of sentence and this discretion is not to be used arbitrarily or whimsically. After assessing all relevant factors, proper sentence should be awarded bearing in mind the principle of proportionality to ensure the sentence is neither excessively harsh nor does it come across as lenient.

8. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ravada Sasikala vs. State of AP AIR 2017 SC 1166***, has reiterated that the imposition of sentence also serves a social purpose as it acts as a deterrent by making the accused realise the damage caused not only to the victim but also to the society at large. The 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



CRA-S-2154-SB-2008

-4-

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.

9. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the learned trial Court indicates no perversity in its findings and the same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, the FIR (supra) was lodged on 05.01.2007 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for about 18 years. Since his conviction, he has grown into a law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life.

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

(i) The judgment dated 05.11.2008 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Barnala, is upheld.

(ii) The order of sentence dated 05.11.2008 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 06 months and fine along with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

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

12. The High Court Legal Services Authority is directed to pay remuneration to the learned *Amicus Curiae*/Legal Aid Counsel, as per rules.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

06.05.2025

Neha

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