



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**242**

**CRR-2381-2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 24.09.2025**

Sanjeev Kumar

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. L.R. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant criminal revision petition assails the judgment and order dated 20.02.2013/22.02.2013 of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Hisar, whereby the petitioner was held guilty and sentenced in case bearing FIR No. 740 dated 15.11.2011, registered under Sections 457 and 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar as well as to the judgment dated 06.06.2016 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, whereby the appeal against the same was dismissed. The petitioner has been sentenced as under:-

S. no.	Under Section(s)	Punishment
1.	380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860	To undergo RI for a period of 03 years and to pay fine of Rs.2000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo SI for a period of 01 month.
2.	457 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860	To undergo RI for a period of 03 years and to pay fine of Rs.2000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo SI for a period of 01 month.



These substantive sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

2. Learned counsel contends that the sentence awarded to the petitioner had been suspended vide order dated 04.08.2016 passed by this Court and at this stage, he does not wish to press the instant petition on merits and confines his prayer to the quantum of punishment and sentence imposed by the trial Court. He prays that the sentence of the petitioner be reduced to that already undergone.

3. The counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that he has no objection in case the prayer is considered.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition, with their able assistance.

5. The object of punishment is not only to punish but also to rehabilitate the offenders in society. Where an accused reflects a strong possibility of improvement by his reformative behaviour, the process of law should come to the aid of such an accused and ensure his reintegration into society.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid certain principles to govern the Courts in the matter of sentencing. Reference in this regard may be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **State of Punjab Vs. Prem Sagar & Ors (2008) 7 SCC 550**. The relevant extract of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow: -

*“5. Whether the Court, while awarding a sentence would take recourse to the principle of deterrence or reform or invoke the*



*doctrine of proportionality, would no doubt depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. While doing so, however, the nature of the offence said to have been committed by the accused plays an important role. The offences which affect public health must be dealt with severely. For the said purpose, the courts must notice the object for enacting Article 47 of the Constitution of India.*

*6. There are certain offences which touch our social fabric. We must remind ourselves that even while introducing the doctrine of plea bargaining in the Code of Criminal Procedure, certain types of offences had been kept out of the purview thereof. While imposing sentences, the said principles should be borne in mind.*

*7. A sentence is a judgment on conviction of a crime. It is resorted to after a person is convicted of the offence. It is the ultimate goal of any justice-delivery system. Parliament, however, in providing for a hearing on sentence, as would appear from sub-section (2) of Section 235, sub-section (2) of Section 248, Section 325 as also Sections 360 and 361 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, has laid down certain principles. The said provisions lay down the principle that the court in awarding the sentence must take into consideration a large number of relevant factors; sociological backdrop of the accused being one of them.*

*8. Although a wide discretion has been conferred upon the court, the same must be exercised judiciously. It would depend upon the circumstances in which the crime has been committed and his mental state. Age of the accused is also*



*relevant.*

9. *What would be the effect of the sentencing on the society is a question which has been left unanswered by the legislature. The Superior Courts have come across a large number of cases which go to show anomalies as regards the policy of sentencing. Whereas the quantum of punishment for commission of a similar type of offence varies from minimum to maximum, even where same sentence is imposed, the principles applied are found to be different. Similar discrepancies have been noticed in regard to imposition of fine.*

10. *In Dhananjay Chatterjee Alias Dhana v. State of W.B. [(1994) 2 SCC 220], this Court held:*

*"15...Imposition of appropriate punishment is the manner in which the courts respond to the society's cry for justice against the criminals. Justice demands that courts should impose punishment befitting the crime so that the courts reflect public abhorrence of the crime..."*

11. *Gentela Vijayavardhan Rao and Another v. State of A.P. [(1996) 6 SCC 241], following Dhananjay Chatterjee (supra), states the principles of deterrence and retribution but the same cannot be categorized as right or wrong. So much depends upon the belief of the judges.*

12. *In a recent decision in Shailesh Jasvantbhai and Another v. State of Gujarat and Others [(2006) 2 SCC 359], this Court opined:*

*"7. The law regulates social interests, arbitrates conflicting claims and demands. Security of persons and property of the people is an essential function of the State. It could be achieved through instrumentality of criminal law. Undoubtedly, there is a cross-cultural conflict where living law must find answer to the new*



*challenges and the courts are required to mould the sentencing system to meet the challenges. The contagion of lawlessness would undermine social order and lay it in ruins. Protection of society and stamping out criminal proclivity must be the object of law which must be achieved by imposing appropriate sentence. Therefore, law as a cornerstone of the edifice of 'order' should meet the challenges confronting the society. Friedman in his *Law in Changing Society* stated that: "State of criminal law continues to be--as it should be--a decisive reflection of social consciousness of society." Therefore, in operating the sentencing system, law should adopt the corrective machinery or deterrence based on factual matrix. By deft modulation, sentencing process be stern where it should be, and tempered with mercy where it warrants to be. The facts and given circumstances in each case, the nature of the crime, the manner in which it was planned and committed, the motive for commission of the crime, the conduct of the accused, the nature of weapons used and all other attending circumstances are relevant facts which would enter into the area of consideration.*

*Relying upon the decision of this Court in *Sevaka Perumal v. State of T.N.* [(1991) 3 SCC 471], this Court furthermore held that it was the duty of every court to award proper sentence having regard to the nature of the offence and the manner in which it was executed or committed etc.*

xxx

18. Don M. Gottfredson in his essay on "Sentencing Guidelines" in "Sentencing by Hyman Gross and Andrew von Hirsch" opines:



*"It is a common claim in the literature of criminal justice and indeed in the popular press that there is considerable "disparity" in sentencing. The word "disparity" has become a prerogative and the concept of "sentencing disparity" now carries with it the connotation of biased or insidious practices on the part of the judges. This is unfortunate in that much otherwise valid criticism has failed to separate justified variation from the unjustified variation referred to as disparity. The phrase "unwarranted disparity" may be preferred; not all sentencing variation should be considered unwarranted or disparate. Much of it properly reflects varying degrees of seriousness in the offense and/or varying characteristics of the offender. Dispositional variation that is based upon permissible, rationally relevant and understandably distinctive characteristics of the offender and of the offense may be wholly justified, beneficial and proper, so long as the variable qualities are carefully monitored for consistency and desirability over time. Moreover, since no two offenses or offenders are identical, the labeling of variation as disparity necessarily involves a value judgment- that is, disparity to one person may be simply justified variation to another. It is only when such variation takes the form of differing sentences for similar offenders committing similar offenses that it can be considered disparate."*

*[Emphasis supplied]*

*The learned author further opines:*

*"In many jurisdictions, judicial discretion is nearly unlimited as to whether or not to incarcerate an individual; and bound only by statutory maxima, leaving a broad range of discretion, as to the length of sentence."*



19. Kevin R. Reitz in *Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice*, Second edition "Sentencing guidelines" states:

*"All guideline jurisdictions have found it necessary to create rules that identify the factual issues at sentencing that must be resolved under the guidelines, those that are potentially relevant to a sentencing decision, and those viewed as forbidden considerations that may not be taken into account by sentencing courts. One heated controversy, addressed differently across jurisdictions, is whether the guideline sentence should be based exclusively on crimes for which offenders have been convicted ("conviction offenses"), or whether a guideline sentence should also reflect additional alleged criminal conduct for which formal convictions have not been obtained ("non-conviction offenses").*

*Another difficult issue of fact-finding at sentence for guideline designers has been the degree to which trial judges should be permitted to consider the personal characteristics of offenders as mitigating factors when imposing sentence. For example: Is the defendant a single parent with young children at home? Is the defendant a drug addict but a good candidate for drug treatment? Has the defendant struggled to overcome conditions of economic, social or educational deprivation prior to the offense? Was the defendant's criminal behavior explicable in part by youth, inexperience, or an unformed ability to resist peer pressure? Most guideline states, once again including all jurisdictions with voluntary guidelines, allow trial courts latitude to sentence outside of the guideline ranges based on the Judge's assessment of such offender characteristics. Some states, fearing that race or class disparities might be*



*exacerbated by unguided consideration of such factors, have placed limits on the list of eligible concerns. (However, such factors may indirectly affect the sentence, since judges are permitted to base departures on the offender's particular 'amenability' to probation (Frase, 1997).)"*

*20. Andrew von Hirsch and Nils Jareborg have divided the process of determining sentence into stages of determining proportionality while determining a sentence, namely:*

*1. What interests are violated or threatened by the standard case of the crime- physical integrity, material support and amenity, freedom from humiliation, privacy and autonomy.*

*2. Effect of violating those interests on the living standards of a typical victim- minimum well-being, adequate well-being, significant enhancement*

*3. Culpability of the offender*

*4. Remoteness of the actual harm as seen by a reasonable man.'*

7. The said issue was also examined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Soman Vs. State of Kerala, (2013) 11 SCC 382**, the relevant extract of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

*'15. Giving punishment to the wrongdoer is at the heart of the criminal justice delivery, but in our country, it is the weakest part of the administration of criminal justice. There are no legislative or judicially laid down guidelines to assist the trial court in meting out the just punishment to the accused facing trial before it after he is held guilty of the charges. In State of Punjab v. Prem Sagar (2008) 7 SCC 550, this Court acknowledged as*



*much and observed as under –*

*“2. In our judicial system, we have not been able to develop legal principles as regards sentencing. The superior courts except making observations with regard to the purport and object for which punishment is imposed upon an offender, have not issued any guidelines. Other developed countries have done so. At some quarters, serious concerns have been expressed in this behalf. Some committees as for example Madhava Menon Committee and Malimath Committee have advocated introduction of sentencing guidelines.”*

*16. Nonetheless, if one goes through the decisions of this Court carefully, it would appear that this Court takes into account a combination of different factors while exercising discretion in sentencing, that is proportionality, deterrence, rehabilitation etc.*

*17. In a proportionality analysis, it is necessary to assess the seriousness of an offence in order to determine the commensurate punishment for the offender. The seriousness of an offence depends, apart from other things, also upon its harmfulness. The question is whether the consequences of the offence can be taken as the measure for determining its harmfulness? In addition, quite apart from the seriousness of the offence, can the consequences of an offence be a legitimate aggravating (as opposed to mitigating) factor while awarding a sentence? Thus, to understand the relevance of consequences of criminal conduct from a sentencing standpoint, one must examine: (1) whether such consequences enhanced the harmfulness of the offence; and (2) whether they are an aggravating factor that need to be taken into account by the courts while deciding on*



*the sentence.*

*xxx xxx xxx*

*26. Punishment should acknowledge the sanctity of human life. We fully agree.*

*27. From the above, one may conclude that:*

*27.1. Courts ought to base sentencing decisions on various different rationales – most prominent amongst which would be proportionality and deterrence.*

*27.2. The question of consequences of criminal action can be relevant from both a proportionality and deterrence standpoint.*

*27.3. Insofar as proportionality is concerned, the sentence must be commensurate with the seriousness or gravity of the offence.*

*27.4. One of the factors relevant for judging seriousness of the offence is the consequences resulting from it.*

*27.5. Unintended consequences/harm may still be properly attributed to the offender if they were reasonably foreseeable. In case of illicit and underground manufacture of liquor, the chances of toxicity are so high that not only its manufacturer but the distributor and the retail vendor would know its likely risks to the consumer. Hence, even though any harm to the consumer might not be directly intended, some aggravated culpability must attach if the consumer suffers some grievous hurt or dies as result of consuming the spurious liquor. ”.*

8. Since the challenge to conviction has been given up, hence, the judgment passed by Courts convicting the petitioner under Sections 457, 380



of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 are affirmed. The same thus leads this Court to examine the issue of proportionate sentence.

9. The following mitigating circumstances are borne out from the record and the same deserve judicial appreciation:-

- (i) The present FIR was registered as far back as on 07.06.2011 and the petitioner has remained embroiled in the ordeal of a prolonged criminal trial for a span of more than 14 years;
- (ii) The record discloses that prior to the suspension of his sentence, the petitioner had already undergone an actual custody for a period of 7 months and 18 days, against the total substantive sentence of 3 years imposed upon him;
- (iii) As per the custody certificate, the petitioner was not involved in any other criminal offence and there is also no material to hold that the petitioner indulged in any such or similar offence after registration of the FIR or at any time after suspension of his sentence;
- (iv) The petitioner was in his twenties at the time of commission of this offence and is now around 40 years old. He would have shifted in his alternative vocation/job and directing him to undergo his balance sentence is likely to deprive the family of the source of livelihood and expose young children to social stigma; and



242

CRR-2381-2016 (O&amp;M)

(v) The offence is not as grave so as to deprance Public Health or stock social conscience.

10. Taking into consideration factors noticed above and that the petitioner has already undergone an actual sentence of 07 months and 18 days, out of a total sentence of 03 years as imposed by the trial Court, I deem it to be a fit case for reduction of sentence.

11. In this backdrop, while the conviction of the petitioner under Sections 457 and 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 is upheld, I am of the view that the ends of justice would be adequately served if the substantive sentence awarded to him is modified.

12. Accordingly, the sentence awarded is modified and reduced to the period already undergone by the petitioner while fine as imposed and sentence, in the event of default, is retained.

13. Petition is accordingly ***partly allowed*** in the terms as aforesaid.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

24.09.2025

Mangal Singh

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