

**IN THE COURT OF R.K.MEHTA, ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
PANIPAT (HARYANA) (UID NO. HR0136).**

State

Versus

1. Rajbir @ Raju son of Babu Ram resident of village Patti Kalyana, Samalkha.
2. Bablu son of Ramchander, resident of village Patti Kalyana, Samalkha.
3. Sandeep @ Monu son of Jagbir, resident of village Patti Kalyana, Samalkha Panipat.

...Convicts

FIR No.432 dated 27.5.2022

Under Sections: 148,149,307,323, 325,506 IPC

Police Station: Samalkha District Panipat.

Present: Sh. Baljit Singh, Public Prosecutor for State assisted by Sh.R.S.Rawal, Advocate for complainant Madan Kumar. Convicts Rajbir @ Raju, Bablu in custody assisted by Sh. Sumit Aggarwal, Advocate. Convict Sandeep @ Monu in custody assisted by Sh.Gaurav Jagga, Sh.Navdeep Kataria and Ms Preeti Sharma, Advocates

ORDER ON THE QUANTUM OF SENTENCE

1. This Court vide judgment dated 17.04.2026 convicted Rajbir @ Raju, Bablu, Sandeep @ Monu for commission of offences punishable under sections 307,323,325,506 read with section 34 IPC on these proved accusations that on 26.5.2022 at about 8.15 A.M. convicts in furtherance of their common intention caused simple and grievous injuries to victims Madan(PW1) and Ravinder (PW2) with iron rods, iron pipe. Injuries of victim Madan were grievous in nature where as injuries of victim Ravinder (PW) included head injury which was dangerous to his life.

Sessions Case No.449-2022
State Versus Rajbir @ Raju & others

2. All the three convicts have been heard on the quantum of sentence. Convict Rajbir @ Raju made following statement:

“It is stated that I am a businessman. I am married having four minor children i.e. two sons and two daughters. My old parents are also dependent on me. There is no other bread earner in the family. I am not a previous convict. Lenient view may be taken on quantum of sentence.”

3. Convict Rajbir @ Raju made following statement:

“It is stated that I am agriculturist by profession. I am married having two minor sons. My parents had expired. There is no other bread earner in the family. I am not a previous convict. Lenient view may be taken on quantum of sentence.

4. Convict Bablu made following statement:

“It is stated that I am a caretaker of a Hotel. I am married having two minor children i.e. one son and one daughter. My old mother is also dependent on me. There is no other bread earner in the family. I am not a previous convict. Lenient view may be taken on quantum of sentence.

5. Ld. Counsel for convicts **submitted** that convicts were the sole bread earners of their families and as per allegations there was no repeated blows. Ld. Counsels prayed for showing leniency in the matter of punishment.

6. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor assisted by Ld. Counsel for complainant for the State **submitted** that convicts were having criminal antecedents and they committed offences in question in a pre planned mind so they did not deserve any leniency. Prosecution prayed for awarding maximum punishment prescribed under the law.

7. After going through the submissions of the convicts, their counsels and learned Public Prosecutor for the State it is **expressed that** having

Sessions Case No.449-2022
State Versus Rajbir @ Raju & others

regard to above submissions it appears that deterrent punishment is required to be awarded to the convicts.

8. Therefore, convicts Rajbir @ Raju, Bablu, Sandeep @ Monu are hereby **sentenced** as under:

Section 307 read **Rigorous imprisonment for 5 years** and fine of **with section 34 IPC Rs.10,000/-** and in default of paying fine to undergo simple imprisonment for three months.

Section 323 read **Rigorous imprisonment for one year** and fine of **with section 34 IPC Rs.1000/-** and in default of paying fine to undergo simple imprisonment for one month.

Section 325 read with **Rigorous imprisonment for two years** and fine of **section 34 IPC Rs.5000/-** and in default of paying fine to undergo simple imprisonment for two months.

Section 506 read with **Rigorous imprisonment for one year** and fine of **section 34 IPC Rs.4000/-** and in default of paying fine to undergo simple imprisonment for two months.

9. All the sentences shall run concurrently. **Fine not paid.**

10. As per record custody period of convicts during the investigation, enquiry and trial of this case are as under:

1.**Rajbir @ Raju** son of Babu Ram: 17.6.2022 to 3.12.2022

2.**Bablu** son of Ram Chander : 17.6.2022 to 9.11.2022

3. **Sandeep @ Monu** son of Jagbir : 23.6.2022 to 25.11.2022

11. It is ordered that above said period of custody, already undergone by the convicts **be set off** against the substantive punishment awarded to the convicts as envisaged under section 428 Cr.P.C. However, period of sentence in default of payment fine shall run after expiry of substantive sentence.

Sessions Case No.449-2022
State Versus Rajbir @ Raju & others

12. The case property, if any, be dealt in accordance with law but after the expiry of period of limitation to file appeal/revision, or the result thereof, as the case may be.

13. **Warrant of committment be prepared accordingly** and convicts be committed to District Jail, Panipat, to undergo the imprisonment of sentence awarded by this Court.

14. A copy of detailed judgment of conviction and order of sentence be supplied to the convicts free of costs, as per rules.

15. File be consigned to the record-room, after due compliance.

Pronounced in open court

(Rajesh Kumar Mehta)
Addl.Sessions Judge,
Panipat.17.04.2026

This order on sentence contains four pages and all pages are checked and signed by me.

(Rajesh Kumar Mehta)
Addl.Sessions Judge,
Panipat.17.04.2026

Typed by: Mamta Rani,
Stenographer Gr.I.