

State Versus Rahul

1

HRRH030070222018



Presented on : 07-03-2018
Registered on : 07-03-2018
Decided on : 13-07-2026
Duration : 8 years, 4 months, 6 days

IN THE COURT OF
Judicial Magistrate - Ist Class
AT ,Rohtak
(Presided Over by Sh. Himanshu Arya)
CHI/438/2018

QUANTUM OF SENTENCE

Present: Mr. Mahesh, APP for the State assisted by Sh. Amit Bhardwaj, counsel for complainant.
Convict Rahul in person with counsel Sh. Satpal Hooda, Advocate.

ORDER

1. This order shall form part of my judgment dated 09.07.2026.
2. Heard on the quantum of sentence. Statement of convict has been recorded separately.

State Versus Rahul

2

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at length on the point of quantum of sentence of present convict.

4. The learned defence counsel Shri Satpal Hooda, Advocate request that convict may kindly be granted concession of probation.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State and Sh. Amit Bhardwaj, learned counsel for complainant has contended that since commission of offence have been duly proved. Hence, convict Rahul be sentenced sternly.

6. The contention of learned defence counsel to release all the accused on probation does not carry weight as Criminal law is designed as mechanism for achieving social control and its purpose is the regulation of conduct and activities within the society. Undue sympathy to impose inadequate sentence would do more harm to justice system to undermine the public confidence in the efficacy of law and society can not long endure under serious threats. It is the duty of every court to award proper sentence having regard to the nature of offence and the manner in which it was executed or committed. Imposition of appropriate sentence is the manner in which court responds to

State Versus Rahul

3

the society's cry for justice against criminals. Justice demands that courts should impose punishment befitting the crime so that the court reflect public abhorrence of the crime.

7. However, no straight jacket formula can perhaps to be laid down on the point of quantum of sentence to be imposed upon the accused and every case is to be viewed in the circumstances peculiar to it. So keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the convict Rahul is sentenced as under:-

Offence	Sentence
Under section 279 of IPC	Simple Imprisonment for a period of six months and fine of Rs. 1000/-.
Under section 336 of IPC	Simple Imprisonment for a period of three months and fine of Rs. 200/-.
Under section 427 of IPC	Simple Imprisonment for a period of six months and fine of Rs. 5000/-.

8. It is made clear that all these sentences shall run concurrently. Further, in default of payment of fine, the convict

State Versus Rahul

4

shall further undergo simple imprisonment for one month. **Fine paid by convict.** Receipt be issued.

File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

Announced in open Court.
Dated :- 13.07.2026

Himanshu Arya
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Rohtak. UID No. HR0681.

Note: All pages have been dictated, checked and signed by me.

Himanshu Arya
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Rohtak. UID No. HR0681.
13.07.2026

Sumit, Stenographer Gr.II

State Versus Rahul

5

Present: Mr. Mahesh, APP for the State assisted by Sh. Amit Bhardwaj, counsel for complainant.
Convict Rahul in person with counsel Sh. Satpal Hooda, Advocate.

Heard on quantum of sentence. Statement of convict also recorded separately.

The convict Rahul was convicted under Sections 279, 336, 427 of IPC and his sentenced is as under:-

Offence	Sentence
Under section 279 of IPC	Simple Imprisonment for a period of six months and fine of Rs. 1000/-.
Under section 336 of IPC	Simple Imprisonment for a period of three months and fine of Rs. 200/-.
Under section 427 of IPC	Simple Imprisonment for a period of six months and fine of Rs. 5000/-.

It is made clear that all these sentences shall run concurrently. Further, in default of payment of fine, the convict shall further undergo simple imprisonment for one month. Fine paid by convict. Receipt be issued.

State Versus Rahul

6

Copy of this judgment and copy of quantum be supplied to convict Rahul free of cost.

An application has been moved by the convict Rahul for suspension of sentence till filing of an appeal against the order of conviction. Heard. In view of the grounds mentioned in the application and keeping in view the fact that the convict were on bail during trial of the case. The applicant/convict ordered to be released on bail for 30 days period on furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety in the like amount. Requisite bonds furnished, accepted and attested. The accused is directed to appear in the court on 12.08.2026 and to submit the proof of preferring appeal otherwise to undergo the period of sentence awarded to her. Concerned Ahlmad is directed to consign the file after separating application under Section 389 Cr.P.C. and the bonds, so that these can be consigned after 12.08.2026.

Announced in open Court:
13.07.2026.

Himanshu Arya,
Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Rohtak.UID No.HR0681.

Sumit, Stenographer Gr. II