

**IN THE COURT OF KARANVIR SINGH, PCS
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE IST CLASS, DHURI.
UID No. PB0489**

Police Challan No. 27/2026
Date of Registration: 09.02.2026
CNR No. PBSGB1000262-2026
Date of Judgment : 09.02.2026

S T A T E

Vs.

Simarjeet Singh son of Hardev Singh, resident of village Katron, PS
Sadar Dhuri.

.....Accused

FIR No. 276 dated 02.11.2025
U/S: 223 of BNS
P.S - Sadar Dhuri

Present: Sh. Girish Garg, APP for the State.
Accused Simarjeet Singh on bail with Sh. Satinder Singh,
Advocate.

J U D G M E N T:

1. The above named accused has been sent to face trial for offence punishable under Section 223 of BNS by the SHO, Police Station Sadar Dhuri.
2. The brief facts of the case of the prosecution are that on 01.11.2025, in the area of village Katron, the accused violated the order bearing no.133/MA dated 15.09.2025 of District Magistrate, Sangrur prohibiting the burning of stubble, thus, committing an offence punishable under Section 223 of BNS. The accused was arrested and released on bail. After completion of investigation, *challan* against the accused was presented in the Court.

3. Upon presentation of the *challan*, the copies of same along with all the accompanying documents were supplied to the accused free of cost. Charge against the accused under Section 223 of BNS was framed, to which the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. Accordingly, the case was fixed for the evidence of the prosecution.

4. In order to prove its case against the accused, prosecution examined PW-1 ASI Surjit Singh, after which, the evidence of the prosecution was closed by learned APP for the State.

5. The statement of the accused under Section 313 of Cr.P.C was recorded, in which all the incriminating evidence appearing against the accused was put to him, to which he pleaded innocence and false implication. The accused opted not to lead any defence evidence.

6. The learned APP for the State has submitted that on 01.11.2025, in the area of village Katron, the accused violated the order bearing no.133/MA dated 15.09.2025 of District Magistrate, Sangrur prohibiting the burning of stubble, thus, committing an offence punishable under Section 223 of BNS. It is submitted that through the testimony of prosecution witness, the entire case of the prosecution stands fully established against the accused. It is prayed that the accused be convicted of the offence charged against him.

7. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the accused has submitted that the accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The learned counsel for the accused prays that the accused be acquitted of the offence alleged against him.

8. I have heard the learned APP for the State and the learned defence counsel and have gone through the record, carefully.

9. The case of the prosecution against the accused is that on 01.11.2025, in the area of village Katron, the accused set fire to the

stubble in his fields, thus, violating the order bearing No 133/MA dated 15.09.2025 promulgated by District Magistrate, Sangrur, prohibiting the same. In order to prove its case against the accused, the prosecution has examined ASI Surjit Singh, the Investigating Officer of the case as PW-1. The said witness appeared and deposed about the accused committing the above mentioned act. The said witness proved on record Copy of letter as Ex. P1, Copy of Challan as Ex. P2, Report of the Patwari regarding the stubble burning as Ex. P3 and his performa as Ex. P4, police proceedings Ruqa as Ex. P5, FIR as Ex. P6, Endorsement on FIR as Ex. P7, Site plan of the place of incident as Ex P8, Special Report in which Gurjeet Singh, Harjeet Singh, Kulvir Singh and Jasvir Singh were declared innocent as Ex. P9, Photographs regarding the stubble burning as Mark A, Arrest cum intimation memo of accused Simarjeet Singh as Ex. P10, personal search memo of accused Simarjeet Singh as Ex. P11, the Order No. 133/MA dated 15.09.2025 of District Magistrate, Sangrur as Ex. P12, Complaint under Section 215 of BNSS as Ex. P13 and List of Cluster Officers as Ex. P14.

10. Nothing has come out from the cross examination of above mentioned prosecution witness, which could create any doubt in the version of the prosecution against the accused. The learned counsel for the accused has submitted that the accused has been falsely implicated in the present case, but the learned counsel has not given any reason for the false implication of the accused by the police. It is not the case of the accused that the police had any enmity with him or had any ulterior motive to falsely implicate him in the present case, thus, there appears no reason for the police to falsely implicate the accused in the case in hand.

11. The version of the prosecution against the accused, as

disclosed by PW-1, has remained intact and has withstood the test of cross examination conducted by the learned counsel for the accused. Thus, in the opinion of this Court, the prosecution has proved its case against the accused beyond all shadows of reasonable doubt. Accordingly, the accused is convicted for the offence punishable under Section 223 of BNS, for violating the order passed by District Magistrate, Sangrur prohibiting the burning of stubble. Let, the convict be heard on quantum of sentence.

**Pronounced in open Court:
09.02.2026**

**(Karanvir Singh)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Dhuri. UID No. PB0489**

Ritu Rani, Stenographer G-II

QUANTUM OF SENTENCE:-

Present: Sh. Girish Garg, APP for the State.
Convict Simarjeet Singh in custody, represented by Sh.
Satinder Singh, Advocate.

12. I have heard the learned counsel for the convict as well as learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for State on the question of sentence. The convict has prayed that he is a marginal farmer and therefore, a lenient view may be taken in his favour.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the antecedents of the convict, instead of sending him to imprisonment, the convict is directed to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- for the offence committed by him. Requisite fine deposited. The convict is accordingly, directed to be released from custody. Case property be dealt with, as per rules, after the expiry of period of appeal/revision, if any. File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court:	(Karanvir Singh)
09.02.2026	Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
	Dhuri. UID No. PB0489

Note:- This judgment contains 5 pages and each page has been dictated, checked & signed by me.

Pronounced in open Court:	(Karanvir Singh)
09.02.2026	Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
	Dhuri. UID No. PB0489

Ritu Rani, Stenographer G-II