



CRA-S-1243-SB-2009 (O&M)

1

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

**CRA-S-1243-SB-2009 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.03.2025**

SONA

...APPELLANT

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. D.N. Ganeriwala, Advocate
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 08.05.2009 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar 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. 300/-	Rigorous imprisonment for 15 days

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the prosecution case are that on 03.04.2005, ASI Surjit Singh alongwith other police officials were going from Phillaur to Muthada Kalan in connection with usual patrolling duty. When the police party reached near Muthada Kalan, they saw one lady coming towards them, who on seeing the police party tried to turn back. On the basis of suspicion, she was apprehended. Her identity was verified. On suspicion, search of the accused-appellant and her belongings was conducted and on checking the plastic bag, held by appellant, poppy husk was found. Two samples each weighing 250 grams were separated from the bulk and the remaining poppy

**CRA-S-1243-SB-2009 (O&M)**

husk upon weighment came to be 9.500 kilograms. Separate parcels of the samples as well as remaining bulk of the poppy husk were prepared, which 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 Counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 08.05.2009 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar on merits and restricts his prayer to modification of the order on quantum of sentence dated 08.05.2009 to that of sentence already undergone by the appellant as she has already undergone a period of 02 months and 09 days out of total sentence of 06 months imposed upon him and she is not involved in any other case.

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 10 kilogram of poppy husk, attracting the offence under Section 15 of NDPS Act, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per her custody certificate, she is not involved in any other case and has already undergone an actual sentence of 02 months and 09 days out of total sentence of 06 months, in the instant case. Moreover, learned counsel for the appellant has not assailed the judgment of conviction on merits. Rather, he has restricted his prayer only qua modification of order on quantum of sentence. 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

**CRA-S-1243-SB-2009 (O&M)**

sentence awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period already undergone by her.

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.

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)

**CRA-S-1243-SB-2009 (O&M)****4**

was lodged on 03.04.2005 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last almost 20 years. Since her conviction, she has grown into a law-abiding citizen and desires 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 08.05.2009 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar is upheld.

(ii) The order of sentence dated 08.05.2009 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 06 months along with fine of Rs. 300/- with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by her.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.03.2025*Ajay Goswami**Whether speaking/reasoned*
*Whether reportable**Yes/No*
Yes/No