



**CRR-500-2015**

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**  
(247)

**CRR-500-2015**  
**Date of decision:12.08.2025**

JOY MALIK

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Surinder Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Kathuria, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)**

The prayer in this petition is for setting aside the judgment dated 04.10.2014 passed by the Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar whereby the appeal filed against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the JMIC, 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Jalandhar dated 03.01.2012 granting probation to accused/respondent Nos.2 to 4 have been dismissed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the accused/respondents No.2 to 4, namely, Ajay Kapoor S/o Chaman Lal, Prem Rani W/o Chaman Lal and Kiran W/o Ajay Kapoor were acquitted under Sections 427 and 452 IPC. They were held guilty and convicted under Sections 323 and 506 IPC. Further, the accused/respondent Nos.2 to 4 were ordered to release on probation for a period of 06 months on furnishing personal bonds in the sum of Rs.10,000/- each with an undertaking to keep peace and good behaviour during the said period and to appear in the Court as and when called by the



**CRR-500-2015**

-2-

Court, to receive sentence. The convicts were further directed to pay Rs.300/- each as litigation.

3. The appeal filed by the petitioner/complainant-Joy Malik came to be dismissed by the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide judgment dated 04.10.2014.

4. Against the aforementioned judgment, the complainant-petitioner/Joy Malik has preferred the present revision petition (CRR-500-2015) challenging the granting of probation to the accused-respondents No.2 to 4.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner-complainant contends that the JMJC, Jalandhar has wrongly released the accused-respondents No.2 to 4 on probation. Therefore, their sentence ought to be enhanced from the grant of probation to the awarding of sentence of imprisonment.

6. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that the period of probation granted to the respondents No.2 to 4 i.e. 06 months has already been elapsed. Therefore, the present revision petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at length.

8. This Court in **Rajinder Singh Versus State of Haryana & others passed in CRM-M-249-2013 dated 27.08.2018**, held as under:-

*“The judgment of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal is dated 27.10.2012, thus, respondent No.2 and 3 have already undergone sentence of probation imposed upon them and, therefore, no reason arises for me to go into the legality or propriety of the impugned judgment.*

**CRR-500-2015****-3-**

*The present petition stands disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.”*

9. In the present case, the judgment of the Lower Appellate Court and the Trial Court are dated 04.10.2014 and 03.01.2012 respectively and therefore, the accused-respondents No.2 to 4, namely, Ajay Kapoor S/o Chaman Lal, Prem Rani W/o Chaman Lal and Kiran W/o Ajay Kapoor have already undergone the sentence of probation imposed upon them. Therefore, there is no requirement for this Court to go into the legality or propriety of the impugned judgment.

10. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of alongwith the pending application(s), if any.

**( JASJIT SINGH BEDI )  
JUDGE**

**August 12, 2025**  
Jitesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No