



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

207

**CRR-1866-2008 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.09.2025**

Kamla RaniPetitioner
Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mrs. Riffi Birla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner has filed the instant revision petition to impugn the order dated 25.08.2008 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri, whereby the appeal preferred by her against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 11.01.2007 and 12.01.2007 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jagadhri, in case FIR No.140 dated 29.05.1997 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 341 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Farakpur, was dismissed, however, her sentence under Section 420 read with Section 34 of the IPC was reduced from 03 years to 02 years.

2. The petitioner was sentenced by the learned Trial Court to undergo imprisonment as under : -

Offence(s) under Section	Period of sentence	Fine imposed	Period of sentence in default of payment of fine
420 of the IPC	SI for 03 years	Rs.5,000/-	SI for 01 month



CRR-1866-2008 (O&M)

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has, at the very outset, fairly conceded that in view of the concurrent findings of fact recorded by the learned Trial Court and learned Appellate Court, she does not intend to assail the conviction of the petitioner on merits. Her submission is confined solely to the quantum of sentence. It is urged that the occurrence pertains to the year 1997, and the petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of 01 month and 24 days. It is further submitted that the petitioner has endured the ordeal of protracted criminal proceedings, is a peace-loving and law-abiding citizen, and has no other criminal antecedents. On these premises, learned counsel pleads for a lenient view, contending that no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the petitioner to further incarceration.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for reduction of sentence while drawing attention to the concurrent findings recorded against the petitioner, it has been submitted that the conviction calls for no interference. However, the learned State counsel is unable to dispute that subsequent to occurrence pertains to the year 1997, the petitioner has maintained good conduct and has not been involved in any other criminal activity.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. In the considered view of this Court, having regard to the facts enumerated hereinabove, particularly the circumstance that the occurrence pertains to the year 1997, and taking note of the fact—



CRR-1866-2008 (O&M)

undisputed by the learned State counsel, that the petitioner has not indulged in any other criminal act thereafter and has otherwise been leading a disciplined and law-abiding life, it would not be appropriate to send her back to prison at this stage of life, especially when she has already borne the brunt of prolonged trial proceedings.

7. In the totality of circumstances, ends of justice would be adequately met if, while upholding the conviction of the petitioner, her substantive sentence of rigorous imprisonment for a period of 02 years is reduced to the period already undergone i.e. 01 months and 24 days.

8. Ordered accordingly.

9. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, the instant revision petition stands disposed of.

10. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

08.09.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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