



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

253

**CRR-1799-2025 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision : 25.09.2025**

SANJAY VERMA

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

..... RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

Present : Mr. Dinesh Saini, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kumar Gujjar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ravi Kumar Girdhwal, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH. J.(Oral)**

1. This revision petition has been filed by the petitioner against the judgment of conviction dated 04.03.2023 and order of sentence dated 06.03.2023 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Panipat "herein after being referred as trial Court". The above-mentioned judgment of conviction and order of sentence have been upheld by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat "herein after being referred as Appellate Court" by virtue of judgment dated 14.07.2025.

2. In nutshell the facts emerging from the record are that the petitioner was facing prosecution for the commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act and while

holding the petitioner guilty for the commission of above-mentioned offence, the learned trial Court awarded sentence to undergo imprisonment for 03 months. Notice of motion in this case was issued qua the quantum of sentence only. Thus the judgment of conviction has become final. Resultantly, no interference can be made with regard to the finding of learned trial Court qua conviction of petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued on the point of quantum of sentence only.

4. Heard.

5. A perusal of record shows that against the sentence of imprisonment for 03 months, the petitioner has already undergone sentence for a period of 02 months and 11 days. Otherwise also against the maximum punishment prescribed for the offence, i.e. 03 years, the petitioner has been awarded sentence for a period of 03 months only, which amounts to a very lenient view. Thus, it is hereby held that there is no scope for interference or indulgence in the order rendered by the learned trial Court with regard to quantum of sentence.

6. Hence, finding no merit, the present revision petition is hereby dismissed.

7. All other pending applications, if any, are also disposed off, accordingly.

**(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.09.2025**

*vipin*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes  
Whether Reportable : No