



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

117

CRR-1986-2024

Date of decision: 30.04.2025

Ajmer Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Ms. Samridhi Sareen, Legal Aid Counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Gguru, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The present criminal revision has been preferred against the judgment dated 25.07.2024 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Mansa whereby appeal filed by the petitioner against judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 11.01.2017 passed by learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mansa to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 02 years under Section 406 IPC has been dismissed.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that she does not want to challenge the conviction of the petitioner on merits. However, she submits that in view of the circumstances of the case, the sentence awarded by the trial Court is on higher side.

3. Here it would be pertinent to mention that the petitioner did not challenge his conviction on merits and only confined his relief qua the quantum of sentence. This Court has also scrutinized the impugned judgments as well as the relevant documents/evidence and is of the considered view that there is no scope



for any interference in impugned judgment as far as the conviction of the petitioner is concerned. As such, the conviction of the petitioner is upheld.

4. As far as the quantum of sentence is concerned, there are mitigating circumstances to take a lenient view in the matter of sentence awarded by the trial court. Apart from the fact that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration of 04 months and 01 days and he is sole bread winner for his family. Thus, this court is of the considered view that a chance be given to the petitioner to reform & improve him; to become a model citizen; and to lead a peaceful & harmonious life.

5. Taking into consideration the above narrated discussion as well as the fact that the petitioner has not challenged his conviction on merits, while affirming his conviction, the order of sentence is modified to the extent to the period already undergone by him with no change to the fine clause.

6. With the aforesaid modification in the quantum of sentence, the present appeal stands dismissed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released forthwith in case he is not required in any other case.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

30.04.2025
manoj

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
- 2. Whether reportable : Yes /No