



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

\*\*\*\*

201

**CRR-2094-2008 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:13.05.2025**

**MANJIT SINGH**

**.....PETITIONER**

**Vs.**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Ms. Pratibha Bali, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (Oral)**

Petitioner-Manjit Singh was tried by Ld. Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nabha, in a case arising out of FIR No.131 dated 14.12.1999 under Sections 341/325/323/34 IPC at Police Station Bhasdson and vide judgment of conviction dated 17.01.2007 by the trial Court, and under Section 341 IPC, he was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month for wrongfully restraining Ramesh Singh and Major Singh; under Section 325 IPC to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of ₹500/- with default sentence of one month rigorous imprisonment in case of non-payment of fine for causing injuries to Ramesh Singh; under Section 323 IPC to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of ₹200/- and in default thereof to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days for causing injuries to Ramesh Singh; and under Section 323 IPC and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of ₹200/- and in default thereof, to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days for causing injuries to Major Singh. On appeal, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence were upheld by the Court of learned Sessions Judge , Patiala vide judgment dated 07.10.2008.

2. Against the abovesaid orders, this revision was filed.

3. Today nobody is appearing on behalf of the petitioner. This Court has gone through the impugned judgments of the Courts below and finds that



conviction has been recorded after proper appreciation of the evidence on record. This Court does not find any reason so as to interfere in the impugned judgment of conviction and as such, the same is hereby maintained.

4. However as far as the impugned order of sentence is concerned it is noticed that petitioner was sentenced maximum for a period of one year rigorous imprisonment and to pay fine of ₹500/- with default sentence of one month rigorous imprisonment in case of non-payment of fine.

5. The custody certificate placed on record by the respondent-State would reveal that petitioner-Manjit Singh had already undergone total sentence of 01 month and 04 days. It is revealed further that petitioner has no other criminal antecedents. The offence had taken place way back in 1999 i.e. 25 years back.

6. Though bailable warrants of the petitioner has been received with the report that he is not residing at the given address but this Court has considered the case on merits.

7. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it will be in the interest of justice, if the period of imprisonment is reduced to the period already undergone by the petitioner, instead of sending him behind bars in the company of hardened criminals.

8. Consequently, the present revision is partly accepted. By maintaining the impugned judgment against conviction, the order of sentence as passed by the trial Court is modified and the petitioner is sentenced to imprisonment for the period already undergone by him. As far as fine is concerned, it will remain same.

9. However, it is made clear that amount of fine, if not paid earlier, shall be deposited before learned Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned, within a period of four weeks from today, failing which the petitioner will have to carry out the complete sentence as imposed by the trial Court.

Disposed of.

**May 13, 2025**

**pry**

**( DEEPAK GUPTA )**

**JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No