



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

**CRA-S-2808-SB-2009  
Date of decision: 25.03.2025**

**HARKRISHAN**

**...APPELLANT**

**V/S**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**...RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

Present: Ms. Neha Bindal, Advocate for  
Mr. Satbir Singh Gill, Advocate  
for the appellant.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

- The prayer in the present appeal is to set aside the judgment of conviction dated 06.11.2009 and order of sentence dated 11.11.2009 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa whereby the appellant was convicted and sentenced for the offence punishable under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as 'NDPS Act'), in the case stemming from FIR No.132 dated 02.06.2006 registered under Section 15/16/61/85 of NDPS Act at Police Station Ellenabad.
- The appellant was sentenced as mentioned below:

| <b>Offence</b>                                                                | <b>Sentence</b>                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Section 15</b> of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 | Rigorous imprisonment for a period of <b>two years</b> and to pay fine of Rs.10,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo SI for two months. |



3. Brief facts of the case are that on 02.06.2006, when SI Ishwar Singh along with other police officials was going from village Moju Khera to village Kripal Patti, in connection with patrolling and reached near Kripal Patti, appellant was seen coming in a car. On seeing the police, he tried to turn the car back, but was apprehended on suspicion. Upon search of car, a gunny bag was recovered, from which, 39.100 kgs of Poppy Straw was recovered. Subsequently, FIR (*supra*) was registered under Section 15 of the NDPS Act.

4. Learned Counsel for the appellant submits that she is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 06.11.2009 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa on merits and restricts her prayer to modification of the order on quantum of sentence dated 11.11.2009 to that of sentence already undergone by the appellant. As per his custody certificate, the appellant has undergone actual custody period of 02 months and 02 days and is not involved in any other case.

5. *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 as such, he does not deserve any leniency.

6. 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 39.100 kgs of poppy straw, which falls under the purview of Section 15 NDPS Act. As per his custody certificate, the appellant has undergone actual custody period of 02 months and 02 days, out of total sentence of two years, in the instant case and is not involved in any other case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section



15 NDPS Act, for the non-commercial quantity 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.

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 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 02.06.2006 and the appellant has been suffering the agony of trial for last more than 18 years. Since his conviction, he has grown into law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life.

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

(i) The judgment dated 06.11.2009 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa is upheld.

(ii) The order of sentence dated 11.11.2009 is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for two years and fine of Rs.10,000/- along with default mechanism awarded to the appellant is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

March 25, 2025  
*manisha*

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

|      |                           |        |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable        | Yes/No |