



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

201

**CRR-2328-2008 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.04.2025**

Baljeet

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. S.K. Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This revision petition has been preferred against the judgment dated 26.07.2005 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, vide which judgment of conviction dated 27.03.2003 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Hisar, in FIR No.301 dated 13.07.1999 registered under Section 324 IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar, District Hisar, has been upheld and the order on quantum of sentence dated 27.03.2003 has been modified and the sentence of 02 years rigorous imprisonment awarded to the petitioner has been reduced to 01 year's rigorous imprisonment.

2. The petitioner was convicted by the learned trial Court vide judgment of conviction dated 27.03.2003 and he was sentenced as follows:

Offence	Sentence
Section 324 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period



	of 02 years and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 02 months.
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Brief facts of the case are that on 12.07.1999, following a medical report regarding Ishwar Singh's admission at Government Hospital, Hisar, S.I. Rohtash Kumar and C. Jagram went to the hospital to initiate necessary action. Thereafter, Ishwar Singh's statement was recorded, which details that at about 09:00 p.m., while he was on his way to home near the main road in Vidhut Nagar, Hisar, Baljeet, armed with a gandasi, attacked him. The weapon struck Ishwar Singh's forehead, and he called for help. His cousin Pawan and uncle Rajbir arrived at the spot and thereafter Baljeet fled away from the spot on his scooter. Ishwar Singh was taken to his home and later to the hospital for treatment. Based on the said statement, the FIR (supra) was registered against the accused.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction dated 26.07.2005 on merits and restricts his prayer qua modification of the order on quantum of sentence, to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioner, as he has already undergone a period of 09 months and 27 days and is not involved in any other criminal activity.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioner on the ground that the learned trial Court has passed a well-reasoned judgment based on correct appreciation of evidence available



on record, which has also been upheld by the learned Lower Appellate Court and as such, the petitioner does not deserve any leniency.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the petitioner was convicted under Section 324 IPC, for which no minimum punishment has been prescribed. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is not involved in any other case and has already undergone an actual sentence of 09 months and 27 days out of total sentence of 01 year, in the instant case. Since there is no minimum punishment prescribed under Section 324 IPC, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in the interest of justice, if the sentence awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

7. In *Deo Narain Mandal Vs. State of UP, (2004) 7 SCC 257*, a three-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has opined that awarding of sentence is not a mere formality in criminal cases. When a minimum and maximum term is prescribed by the statute with regard to the period of sentence, a discretionary element is vested in the Court. Background of each case, which includes factors like gravity of the offence, the manner, in which the offence is committed, age of the accused, should be considered, while determining the quantum of sentence and this discretion is not to be used arbitrarily or whimsically. After assessing all relevant factors, proper sentence should be awarded bearing in mind the principle of proportionality to ensure the sentence is neither excessively harsh nor does it come across as lenient.



8. Further, a two-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ravada Sasikala Vs. State of AP, AIR 2017 SC 1166*, has reiterated that the imposition of sentence also serves a social purpose, as it acts as a deterrent by making the accused realise the damage caused not only to the victim, but also to the society at large. The law in this regard is well settled that opportunities of reformation must be granted and such discretion is to be exercised by evaluating all attending circumstances of each case by noticing the nature of the crime, the manner, in which the crime was committed and conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

9. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the learned Court below indicates no perversity in its findings and the same is based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not assailed the judgment of conviction on merits, rather he has restricted his prayer only qua modification of quantum of sentence already undergone by the petitioner.

10. The FIR in the present case was registered on 13.07.1999 and the petitioner has been suffering the agony of trial since the last more than 25 years. Since his conviction, the petitioner has grown into a law-abiding citizen and desires to live a peaceful life.

11. Consequently, the present revision petition is disposed of in the following terms:-



The judgment dated 26.07.2005 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, affirming the judgment of conviction dated 27.03.2003 is upheld, however, the order of sentence of even date, is modified to the extent that the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 01 year and fine of Rs.500/- along with default mechanism awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period of sentence already undergone by him.

12. All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

07.04.2025

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No