



CRA-S-1730-SB-2009 (O&amp;M)

1

201 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-1730-SB-2009 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 08.04.2025

HARMEET SINGH @ MEETA

...APPELLANT

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Diya Bhagwan, Advocate as *Amicus Curiae*,  
for the appellant.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*

**Harpreet Singh Brar, J. (Oral)**

1. Present appeal has been preferred by the appellant against the judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence dated 11.07.2009 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Barnala vide which the appellant has been convicted and sentenced as mentioned below:

Offence under Section	Sentence	Fine	Sentence in default of payment of fine
15 of NDPS Act	Rigorous imprisonment for 06 months	Rs. 1,000/-	Rigorous imprisonment for 01 month

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 26.02.2008, ASI Baljit Singh along with other police officials were on patrolling duty in an official canter and proceeding from link road Thikariwal to village Raisar. When the police party was at about 1-1/2 kilometre short of village Raisar, Amarjit Singh joined the police party. When the police party was 50 yards short of petrol pump in the area of Raisar, at about 7.00 A.M., they saw the accused-appellant sitting on the side of the road and taking out something from the plastic bag and putting them in a *lifafa*. On suspicion, the accused-appellant was apprehended. Search of accused-appellant alongwith his belongings was conducted. Thereafter, on search of

**CRA-S-1730-SB-2009 (O&M)**

plastic bag, held by the appellant, poppy husk was recovered. Out of the poppy husk, two samples each of 250 grams were separated and remaining on weighment was found to be 4.500 kilograms. All the parcels were sealed. FIR(*supra*) was registered under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter to be referred as 'NDPS Act').

3. Learned *Amicus Curiae* for the appellant *inter alia* contends that independent witness namely Amarjit Singh was joined during the alleged recovery but he was not examined by the prosecution. Rather, he had appeared as defence witness and denied that the alleged recovery was witnessed by him. Further CFSL form was not prepared at the spot, nor the same was deposited in the Malkhana along with the case property. Further, PW-1 Inspector Harpal Singh has admitted in his cross-examination that he has not physically verified the contents of the parcel. Further, there is a delay of 05 days in sending the representative sample to the office of Chemical Examiner. Lastly she contends that the appellant is not involved in any other case and has undergone a period of 01 month and 10 days of custody out of total sentence of 06 months awarded to him.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the appellant 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, the appellant 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 5 kilograms of poppy husk, attracting the offence under Section 15 of NDPS Act, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. Perusal of custody certificate indicates that appellant is not involved

**CRA-S-1730-SB-2009 (O&M)**

in any other case and he has already undergone custody of 01 month and 10 days out of total sentence of 06 months, in the instant case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section 15 of 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. In **Deo Narain Mandal v. State of UP (2004) 7 SCC 257**, a three Judge bench of 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.

7. Further, a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ravada Sasikala v. 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 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.

**CRA-S-1730-SB-2009 (O&M)****4**

8. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the learned trial Court indicates no perversity in its findings and the said judgment is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, the FIR (supra) was lodged on 26.02.2008 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last more than 17 years. Since his conviction, the appellant has reformed into a law-abiding citizen and intends to live a peaceful life.

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

(i) The judgment dated 11.07.2009 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Barnala is upheld.

(ii) The order of sentence dated 11.07.2009 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 06 months and fine of Rs. 1,000/- with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

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

11. High Court Legal Services Committee is directed to pay remuneration to the *Amicus Curiae*, as per rules.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

**08.04.2025***Ajay Goswami**Whether speaking/reasoned*  
*Whether reportable**Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*