



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

204

CRR-1486-2008 (O&M)

Date of decision: August 29th, 2025

Jarnail Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Bhriugu Dutt Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is challenging the judgment dated 15.07.2008 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track Court), Kapurthala, whereby the appeal preferred by him against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 24.12.2004 passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala, in FIR No.37 dated 21.04.1999 under Sections 279/427/337/338/304-A of the IPC registered at Police Station Sadar, Kapurthala, vide which the petitioner was convicted and sentenced as follows, was dismissed:-

Offence(s) under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
279 IPC	RI for 3 months	₹500/-	R.I. for 15 days
338 IPC	RI for 1 year	₹1,000/-	R.I. for 1 month
337 IPC	-	₹500/-	R.I. for 15 days
304-A IPC (for causing death of Jit Singh)	RI for 1 year	₹1,000/-	R.I. for 1 month

304-A IPC (for causing death of Gurpreet Singh)	RI for 1 year	₹1,000/-	R.I. for 1 month
--	---------------	----------	------------------

2. All the sentences were ordered to be run concurrently.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset, submits that he does not wish to assail the findings of conviction recorded by the learned trial Court on merits. His submissions are, therefore, confined solely to the aspect of quantum of sentence.
4. It is further contended that the incident in question pertains to the year 1999, and ever since, the petitioner who is now 59 years of age, has been facing the ordeal of prolonged trial proceedings, spanning more than two decades. Learned counsel submits that out of the substantive sentence of one year imposed upon him, the petitioner has already undergone actual incarceration of 3 months and 16 days. In these circumstances, it is urged that a lenient view be taken while considering the question of sentence, particularly in light of the protracted nature of the proceedings and the period of imprisonment already undergone.
5. In support of this plea, reliance has been placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sagar Loliengar Versus The State Of Goa 2022 (1) SCC 161*, wherein it has been observed that even in cases involving conviction under Section 304-A of the IPC, the substantive sentence of imprisonment can, in appropriate circumstances, be reduced to the period already undergone.
6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for reduction of sentence. While placing reliance upon the concurrent

findings recorded against the petitioner by both the courts below, it has been contended that the gravity of the offence, coupled with the established culpability of the petitioner, does not warrant any further leniency in the matter of sentence. However, learned State counsel fairly concedes that subsequent to the accident of 1999, the petitioner has maintained good conduct and has not been found involved in any other criminal case.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the judgment dated 24.12.2004 passed by the learned trial Court as well as the judgment dated 15.07.2008 rendered by the learned Lower Appellate Court affirming the conviction of petitioner.

8. Both the Courts below have returned concurrent findings of guilt, which are borne out from the evidence on record and do not suffer from any illegality, irregularity or perversity. Hence, the conviction of the petitioner is affirmed. The only question that survives for consideration is that of sentence. It is undisputed fact that the accident in question took place more than 26 years ago. During this entire period, the petitioner has faced the ordeal of protracted criminal proceedings. It is also not disputed that he has not been involved in any other criminal case either prior to or after the occurrence, and has maintained good conduct. The petitioner has already undergone more than three months of incarceration.

9. Having regard to the aforesaid circumstances, including the long passage of time since the incident, the clean antecedents of the petitioner, and the period of imprisonment already undergone, this Court is of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be adequately met by reducing the substantive sentence to the period

already undergone while enhancing the quantum of fine.

10. Accordingly, while upholding the conviction of the petitioner, the substantive sentence of one year rigorous imprisonment awarded to him is hereby reduced to the period already undergone.

11. However, the fine imposed upon the petitioner is enhanced from ₹1,000/- to ₹20,000/- under Section 304-A of the IPC.

12. It is made clear that in the event of failure on the part of the petitioner to deposit the enhanced fine before the learned trial/successor Court within a period of two months from today, the benefit of reduction of sentence shall not accrue to him, and he shall be required to undergo the remaining part of the sentence awarded by the Courts below.

13. Upon deposit of the enhanced fine, the learned trial/successor Court shall ensure that the amount is released to the legal representatives of the deceased after due notice and proper identification.

14. With the aforesaid modifications, the revision petition stands disposed of.

August 29th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No