

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI RAMAN SHARMA,
ADDITIONAL CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
SHAHEED BHAGAT SINGH NAGAR.**

Case No.25/1/2018
Date of Institution: 11.4.2018
Decided on: 16.9.2021
CNR No. PBSB03-001142-2018
CIS CHI No.115-2018

State of Punjab

Vs.

1. Harjot Singh alias Jota son of Avtar Singh, resident of Kang, Police Station, Rahon, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.
2. Makhan Singh son of Santokh Singh, resident of Kang, Police Station, Rahon, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.
3. Ramandeep Singh alias Ramna son of Jarnail Singh, resident of Kang, Police Station, Rahon, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.
4. Harjit Kumar alias Jeeta son of Sohan Lal,, resident of Kang, Police Station, Rahon, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.

-----Accused

In Re: FIR No.175, Dated 25.11.2017, Under Sections 323, 325,341 and 34 IPC Police Station, Rahon, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.
Accused Harjot Singh alias Jota, Makhan Singh, Ramandeep Singh alias Ramna and Harjit Kumar alias Jeeta on bail.
Shri Manish Bhambi, Advocate, counsel for the accused.

J U D G M E N T

1. The above named accused have been sent up before the Court by the S.H.O of Police Station Rahon (District SBS Nagar), to face trial for commission of offences falling under Section 323,325, 341 read with

Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. The present case was registered on the statement of Sandeep Sharma, complainant, which, in brief, is to the effect that on 14.11.2017, he went to the house of Lavi Kang resident of Kang to deliver his mobile phone. On the way Makhan Singh son of Santokh Singh met the complainant. He asked the complainant that he has damaged their gate to which the complainant replied that he had not done so. Then Makhan Singh started slapping the complainant. Thereafter, complainant went to village Bharta. From there he left on motorcycle towards Rahon. At about 11:30 a.m. when the complainant reached near turn of Guru Nanakpur Rahon, aforesaid Makhan Singh alongwith, Harjit Singh alias Jeeta, Ramna & Jota, all residents of Kang, came in a Verna car and they stopped the complainant. Accused Makhan Singh gave blow of "Dattar" towards the head of the complainant but the complainant raised his left hand to ward off the blow and the blow hit on the little finger of left hand of the complainant. Harjit Singh gave blow of handle of spade on the head of the complainant which hit near left ear of the complainant. Accused Jota gave blow of handle of spade on the right shoulder and accused Ramna gave "danda" blows on the back of the complainant. Complainant raised hue and cry and thereafter all the assailants ran away from the spot. Thereafter complainant called his friends at the spot who got the complainant admitted in civil hospital for treatment.

3. On the basis of statement of complainant, ruqa was sent to police station, on the basis of which, formal FIR was registered.

Investigation was conducted. The place of occurrence was visited, statements of the witnesses were recorded. Accused were arrested. After completion of all necessary formalities, challan against the accused was prepared and presented in the Court.

4. On presentation of challan in the court, copies of the challan and relevant documents relied upon by the prosecution were supplied to the accused free of costs as required under Section 207 Cr.P.C.

5. After finding prima facie case against the accused, under Sections 341, 323 and 325 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, charge was framed against the accused under the said offences to which the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

6. In order to prove its case, the prosecution has examined PW1 Sandeep Sharma, PW-2 ASI Kewal Krishan, PW-3 Sachin Kapoor, Radiographer, PW-4 Gurpal Singh, Ward Attendant, PW-5 ASI Amarjit Singh & PW-6 Dr. Anjvinder Chahal.

7. After closure of the evidence of prosecution, the statements of accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C., were recorded, wherein they denied all the incriminating evidence appearing against them. Despite availing sufficient opportunities, accused did not opt to lead any evidence in their defence.

8. I have heard learned APP for the State as well as learned defence counsel and have gone through the record on file with their able assistance.

9. In order to prove its case, the prosecution examined Sandeep

Sharma, complainant of the case as PW1 and has deposed that he is working at Mobile Repair shop, under the name and style, Raja Telecom, at Nawanshahr. On 14.11.2017 at about 10:00 AM, he was going to deliver a phone to Lavi Kang at his residence at village Kang. On the way he met Makhan Singh son of Santokh Singh of village Kang who told him that he has caused damage to his gate. When the complainant requested him that no damage has been caused by the complainant, he started slapping the complainant and thereafter complainant went to village Bharta Khurd. Thereafter, when complainant was going towards Rahon side on motorcycle bearing No. PB-32-S-3002 at about 11:30 AM, he reached near Guru Nanak Pur road Rahon turn. At that time, accused Makhan Singh, Harjit Singh @ Jita, Jota and Ramna came there in a Verna car. Accused Makhan Singh was armed with 'datar' and accused Harjit Singh @ Jita and Jota were armed with handle of spade and accused Ramna was armed with 'danda'. At once, they attacked on the complainant. Accused Makhan Singh, gave datar blow which, hit upon little finger of left hand of complainant, accused Harjit Singh gave a blow with handle of spade, which hit upon left side of head and on left ear, accused Jota gave blow of handle of spade which hit upon right shoulder and accused Ramna gave blows of 'danda' upon back of the complainant. Thereafter all the accused ran away from the spot with their respective weapons. Thereafter, complainant made telephonic call to Harjinder Singh resident of village Bharta Khurd who reached on the spot alongwith Sam and Manjinder and they got admitted the complainant at Civil Hospital

Nawanshahr where complainant was medically treated. His statement ExPA was recorded, on which complainant identified his signatures. Complainant identified all the accused present in the Court.

10. Investigating Officer of the case ASI Kewal Krishan stepped into the witness box as PW2 and has deposed that on 14.11.2017, he along with HC Amarjit Singh went to Civil Hospital and moved an application before the concerned Doctor, who declared injured to be fit to make the statement. However, complainant refused to suffer statement stating that he is not feeling well. He further deposed that on 16.11.2017 he recorded statement of the complainant who signed the same after admitting it to be correct. He has further proved the application ExPW2/A, endorsement of doctor Ex.PW2/A1, statement of complainant Ex.PW1/A, DDR No.21 dated 16.11.2017 Ex.PW2/B, FIR Ex.PW2/C, rough site pan Ex.PW2/D, police proceedings ExPW2/E, endorsement of FIR Ex.PW2/E1, rough site plan of the spot Ex.PW2/F and arrest memos Ex.PW2/G to PW2/G3,

11. PW-3 Sachin Kapoor, Radiographer, Civil Hospital Nawanshahr has deposed that patient Sandeep Sharma was referred to him for x-ray of left little finger AP/oblique. He conducted x-ray Ex.PW3/A and handed over the x-ray film Ex.PW3/A to Dr. Ajwinder Chahal.

12. PW-4 Gurpal Singh, Ward Attendant has deposed that patient Sandeep Sharma was admitted in Civil Hospital Nawanshahr on 14.11.2017 and was discharged on 17.11.2017. He has proved on record bed head ticket Ex.PW4/A of patient Sandeep Sharma.

13. PW-5 ASI Amarjit Singh has deposed that on 30.11.2017 he

was joined in the investigation by ASI Kewal Krishan. He has deposed that arrest memos Ex.PW2/G to PW2/G3 were attested by him.

14. PW-6 Dr. Anjvinder Chahal has deposed that on 14.11.2017 she was posited as Emergency Medical Officer at Civil Hospital Nawanshahr. Patient Sandeep Sharma was admitted in Civil Hospital Nawanshahr on 14.11.2017 and was discharged on 17.11.2017. On 14.11.2017 she medico legally examined patient Sandeep Sharma and she observed following injuries on his person:-

1. Lacerated wound 2cm x0.5 cmx0.5 cm on left occipital area of scalp.
2. Lacerated bleeding wound on left little finger distal phalanx, almost encircling the tip close of the nail bed.
3. Reddish blue bruises on the back, 5 in number, lying obliquely, measuring 17 inches x 1 inch, 12 inches x inch, 10x1 inches, 8x1 inches, 6x1 inches.

15. PW6 Dr. Anjvinder Chahal has further proved on record medico legal report of complainant Sandeep Sharma as Ex.PW.6/B, pictorial diagram Ex.PW.6/C, x-ray film of patient Ex.PW.3/A, x-ray report Ex.PW3/B, vide which injury No.2 was declared grievous in nature. She has also proved on record bed head ticket of the patient as Ex.PW4/A.

16. Learned APP for the State submitted during the course of arguments that the testimony of the witnesses examined by prosecution is sufficient for proving the guilt of the accused and therefore, accused are

liable to be convicted for the commission of offences for which they have been charged.

17. On the other hand, learned defence counsel, while raising several arguments which will be discussed in the later part of this judgment, prayed for acquittal of accused.

18. After hearing the contentions of learned counsel for both the parties, I have perused the file carefully. The point for determination in the present case is framed to the following effect:-

Whether on 14.11.2017, all the accused in furtherance of their common intention wrongfully restrained complainant Sandeep Sharma and caused simple as well as grievous injuries on his person?

19. After considering the rival submissions of learned counsel for both the parties and the material/evidence on record, this Court is of the view that prosecution has successfully proved its case against the accused for commission of offences for which they have been charged. In this case, above said accused have been charged for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 325 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

20. The allegations against the accused are to the effect that on 14.11.2017, the accused persons in furtherance of their common intention restrained the complainant and thereafter caused simple as well as grievous injuries on the person of the complainant with their respective weapons. In order to prove the above said facts, the prosecution has examined PW1 Sandeep Sharma, PW-2 ASI Kewal Krishan, PW-3

Sachin Kapoor, Radiographer, PW-4 Gurpal Singh, Ward Attendant, PW5 ASI Amarjit Singh & PW-6 Dr. Anjvinder Chahal.

21. Complainant Sandeep Sharma while stepping in the witness box as PW1 has specifically stated that on 14.11.2017 at about 10 a.m., when he went to deliver the mobile phone to one Lavi Kang of village Kang, accused Makhan Singh met him on the way and after indulging in an altercation with him accused Makhan Singh started slapping him on the ground that the complainant has damaged his gate. Complainant has further stated that on the same day, when he was going towards Rahon from village Bharta Khurd, all the accused persons came in a Verna car and stopped the complainant. As per the statement of the complainant, accused Makhan Singh was armed with “Dattar”, accused Harjit Singh and Jota were armed with handle of spade while accused Ramna was armed with “danda”. Complainant has further given the details with regard to the injuries as inflicted by each accused on his person. As per the complainant, accused Makhan Singh gave a “dattar” blow on the little finger of his left hand, accused Harjit Singh gave a blow with handle of spade on the left side of his head/ left ear, accused Jota gave a blow of handle of spade on the right shoulder of the complainant, while accused Ramna gave several blows with “danda” on the back of the complainant. Further, the complainant identified all the accused persons who were present in the Court. The testimony of the complainant has found sufficient corroboration from the statement of Dr. Anjvinder Chahal, Ex-medical officer, Civil Hospital, Nawanshahr. On the relevant date i.e.

14.11.2017, the complainant was medico legally examined by Dr. Anjvinder Chahal and this witness has given the details of the injuries which were found on the person of the complainant at the time of his medico legal examination. Further, Dr. Anjvinder Chahal has also proved on record the medico legal report of complainant Sandeep Sharma as Ex.PW.6/B, pictorial diagram showing seats of injuries on the person of the complainant as Ex.PW.6/C, x-ray film as Ex.PW.3/A and x-ray report Ex.PW3/B vide which injury No.2 on the person of the complainant was declared to be grievous in nature. Further, as per the medico legal report of the complainant the kind of weapon used for inflicting all the injuries on the person of the complainant was blunt. The prosecution has also examined Sachin Kapoor, Radiographer as PW.3 who has proved on record the x-ray film Ex.PW/3A pertaining to the x-ray as conducted on the person of the complainant. Further, PW-4 Gurpal Singh has proved on record the bed head ticket pertaining to the complainant as Ex.PW4/A. The investigating officer of the case has also been examined by the prosecution as PW2. This witness i.e. PW2 ASI Kewal Krishan has deposed with regard to the investigation as conducted by him in this case and has proved on record all the material documents prepared by him during the course of investigation.

22. The testimony of the above said witnesses is sufficient to prove beyond reasonable doubt that on the relevant date i.e. 14.11.2017, all the accused persons, in furtherance of their common intention, wrongfully restrained the complainant and caused simple as well as

grievous injuries on his person. All these witnesses were cross examined at length by ld. defence counsel, but nothing turned out in the cross-examination of the above said witnesses from which it can be said that they are not speaking the truth. The manner in which all the accused persons acted at the time of occurrence goes to show that they in-fact acted in furtherance of their common intention to inflict injuries on the person of the complainant.

23. During the course of arguments, it was submitted by learned defence counsel that complainant has stated in his cross examination that he was rescued from the clutches of the accused by one person namely Lavi. As per the learned defence counsel, the above said person has not been cited as a witness by the prosecution nor he has been examined in this case for the purpose of proving the case of the prosecution. The learned defence counsel further submitted that testimony of the above said witness was material for the purpose of bringing home the guilt of the accused persons and in the absence of examination of the above said witness, the case of the prosecution cannot be said to have been proved beyond reasonable doubt. However, the above said argument of learned defence counsel has failed to impress this Court. The testimony of witnesses as examined by the prosecution in this case is sufficient to bring home the guilt of the accused persons for the commission of offences for which they have been charged. The mere fact that above said person has not been examined by the prosecution in this case cannot be said to be sufficient for brushing aside the trustworthy evidence that has been

adduced by the prosecution in support of its case. The above said argument of the learned defence counsel accordingly stands rejected. Learned defence counsel further submitted that the complainant has stated in his cross examination that his friends namely Harjinder Singh, Sam and Manjinder Singh took him to the Civil hospital and got him admitted in the hospital. However, as per the learned counsel, perusal of the MLR of the complainant goes to show that the name of the above said persons is nowhere reflected in the MLR and that name of one Surinder Kumar has been mentioned in the MLR as relative of the injured/ complainant. As per the learned counsel, this raises a doubt with regard to the case of the prosecution. However, even this argument of learned defence counsel is noticed only to be rejected. The facts as put forth by learned counsel by way of the above said argument are not at all sufficient to discard the case of the prosecution. The fact remains that the prosecution has adduced the cogent/convincing evidence in support of its case and the case of the prosecution against the accused persons stands proved from the evidence so adduced by the prosecution. The above referred argument as advanced by learned defence counsel cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said to be sufficient for discarding the case/ evidence of the prosecution. So, even the above said argument of the learned counsel stands rejected. The learned defence counsel further submitted that the complainant has stated in his cross-examination that he got his statement recorded with the police officials on the date of occurrence itself. However, as per the learned counsel, the alleged occurrence took place on 14.11.2017 while the

statement of the complainant i.e. PW1/A has been recorded on 16.11.2017. As per the learned counsel, the above said contradiction goes to raise doubt with regard to the trustworthiness of the case of the prosecution. However, this Court is of the considered view that even the above said argument of learned counsel is without any solid basis. Such type of minor contradictions, as referred by the learned defence counsel, are bound to occur due to passage of time and limitations of human memory. Much weight cannot be given to such type of minor contradictions so as to give any undue/ unjust benefit to accused persons. So, even the above referred argument of learned counsel stand repelled.

24. The learned defence counsel, while referring to the cross-examination of the complainant, further submitted that the complainant has stated in his cross-examination that the accused came at the spot in a Verna Car. However, as per the learned counsel, in his supplementary statement as suffered before the police, complainant has submitted that the accused persons came at the spot on foot and not in a Verna Car. As per the learned counsel, the above said fact raises a doubt with regard to the trustworthiness of the complainant as a witness. However, the above said argument of learned counsel cannot be given much weightage. If the learned counsel wanted to take any advantage from the supplementary statement of the complainant, then in his cross-examination, the attention of complainant was required to be called to that part of the statement which was to be used for the purpose of contradicting him. However, no such step has been taken by the learned defence counsel while cross

examining the complainant and in such a situation the argument as advanced by learned defence counsel loses significance and same stand rejected accordingly.

25. The learned defence counsel further submitted during the course of argument that the complainant, in his cross-examination, has submitted that accused Makhan Singh gave a blow with “dattar” on his person with full force. As per the learned defence counsel, if the blow with “Dattar” on the person of the complainant was given by accused Makhan Singh with full force then it cannot be believed that the said blow gave an injury only on little finger of the complainant. Consequently, as per the learned counsel, the statement of the complainant cannot be said to be the worthy of trust and the injury on the little finger of complainant was self inflicted. However, even this argument of learned counsel is without any merits. The evidence on record is sufficient to prove that accused Makhan Singh being armed with ‘Dattar’ inflicted injuries on the person of the complainant alongwith other accused persons. The evidence adduced by the prosecution is trustworthy and the above said argument of learned defence counsel is not sufficient so as to raise any doubt over the case of prosecution. The learned defence counsel further referred to the statement of PW.2 ASI Kewal Krishan. As per learned counsel, PW-2 ASI Kewal Krishan has specifically stated in his examination in-chief that the doctor declared the complainant/injured to be fit to give statement on 14.11.2017 itself. However, as per the learned counsel, the complainant suffered the statement on 16.11.2017 and there is no explanation

forthcoming from the side of the prosecution as to why the complainant did not suffer the statement with the police authorities on 14.11.2017 and 15.11.2017. As per the learned defence counsel, this thing raises a doubt with regard to the genuineness of the case of the prosecution. However, even the said submission of learned counsel has failed to find any favour from the court. PW.2 ASI Kewal Krishan, in his examination in-chief itself, has stated that though the Doctor declared the complainant/injured to be fit to give the statement on 14.11.2017 but the complainant did not suffer the statement on said date as he was not feeling well. PW.2 ASI Kewal Krishan has further added that on 15.11.2017 also the complainant did not suffer the statement as he was not feeling well and consequently the statement of the complainant was recorded on 16.11.2017. So, sufficient explanation is there in the statement of PW.2 ASI Kewal Krishan as to why the statement of the complainant was recorded on 16.11.2017 and not on the day of occurrence i.e. 14.11.2017. So even the above said argument of learned defence counsel stands rejected. The learned defence counsel further submitted that PW-2 ASI Kewal Krishan has stated in his cross-examination that he has not seen the case property in the Court and further that there is no case property in this case. As per the learned defence counsel, this thing makes the case of the prosecution doubtful. However, as already referred in the earlier part of this judgment, the case of the prosecution is proved beyond reasonable doubt against all the accused persons from the convincing evidence as adduced by the prosecution in this case. The above said submission as made by the

learned counsel cannot be said to be sufficient for disbelieving the testimony of the witnesses examined by the prosecution which is duly supported by the medical evidence. So even the above said argument of learned counsel is found to be without any merit and the same stands repelled. Lastly, the ld. defence counsel referred to the document Ex.D1. As per ld. counsel, Ex.D1 is the zimni order dated 14.11.2017 as passed by the court of the then Ld. CJM, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar in case titled as Sarabjit Versus Pammo. The ld. counsel further submitted that accused Harjot Singh is also one of the accused persons in the above noted case and his signatures are there on the left side of above said zimni order dated 14.11.2017. As per ld. counsel, this thing goes to show that accused Harjot Singh was present in the court in above noted case on 14.11.2017 and therefore it cannot be believed that on the same day he inflicted injuries on the person of complainant Sandeep Sharma. However, even the abovesaid submission of the ld. counsel is without any merits. Though the presence of accused Harjot Singh is marked in the abovesaid case by way of obtaining his signatures, but this is not sufficient for concluding that the accused Harjot Singh did not cause any injury to complainant Sandeep Sharma on 14.11.2017 because from the document Ex.D1 it cannot be ascertained at what particular time on 14.11.2017, accused Harjot Singh got his presence marked in above said case nor can it be said that accused Harjot Singh remained present in the court in abovesaid case for whole of the day. So, the abovesaid document Ex.D1 is not of much help for accused Harjot Singh and the argument

advanced by ld. defence counsel stands repelled accordingly. No other argument worth consideration was advanced by the learned defence counsel.

26. In view of the aforementioned discussion, this Court has reached to the conclusion that prosecution has successfully proved its case against accused Harjot Singh alias Jota, Makhan Singh, Ramandeep Singh alias Ramna and Harjit Kumar alias Jeeta for commission of offences falling under Sections 325, 323, 341 IPC read with Section 34 of IPC and the point for determination is accordingly decided in favour of prosecution. Accused Harjot Singh, Ramandeep Singh and Harjit Kumar are held guilty for commission of offences punishable under Sections 341, 323 IPC as well as for offence under section 325 IPC read with section 34 IPC and are accordingly convicted for said offences. Accused Makhan Singh is held guilty for commission of offences punishable under Sections 341, 323 and 325 of I.P.C. and is accordingly convicted for said offences. Let, the convicts be heard on the question of sentence.

Pronounced in open Court:
Dated: 16.9.2021.
SATISH KUMAR

Raman Sharma,
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.
UID No. PB-0251.

Present: Ld. APP for the State.
Convicts Harjot Singh alias Jota, Makhan Singh, Ramandeep Singh alias Ramna and Harjit Kumar alias Jeeta in person.
Shri Manish Bhambi, Advocate, counsel for the accused.

27. Upon hearing the convicts on the question of sentence, convicts Harjot Singh alias Jota, Ramandeep Singh alias Ramna and Harjit Kumar alias Jeeta have submitted that they are poor persons and are

the only bread winners of their families and prayed for taking lenient view while granting sentence.

28. Convict Makhan Singh has submitted that he is poor person and is the only bread winner of his family, his parents have already expired and prayed for taking lenient view while granting sentence.

29. On the other hand, learned APP has opposed the submission of convicts and has submitted that convicts did not deserve any leniency.

30. Keeping in view the attending facts and circumstances of the case as well as nature of the offences so committed, this Court does not find it a fit case where the benefit of probation could be extended to the convicts. Accordingly, convicts are sentenced as under:-

CONVICT HARJOT SINGH ALIAS JOTA:

Sr. No.	Under Section	Sentence awarded
1.	325 IPC r/w S. 34 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of Rs.1500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 15 days.
2.	323 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three months and to pay fine of Rs.500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 days.
3.	341 IPC	To undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month and to pay fine of Rs.200/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 5 days.

CONVICT RAMANDEEP SINGH ALIAS RAMNA:

Sr. No.	Under Section	Sentence awarded
1.	325 IPC r/w S. 34 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of

- | | | |
|----|---------|---|
| | | Rs.1500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 15 days. |
| 2. | 323 IPC | To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three months and to pay fine of Rs.500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 days. |
| 3. | 341 IPC | To undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month and to pay fine of Rs.200/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 5 days. |

CONVICT HARJIT KUMAR ALIAS JEETA:

Sr. No.	Under Section	Sentence awarded
1.	325 IPC r/w S. 34 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of Rs.1500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 15 days.
2.	323 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three months and to pay fine of Rs.500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 days.
3.	341 IPC	To undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month and to pay fine of Rs.200/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 5 days.

CONVICT MAKHAN SINGH:

Sr. No.	Under Section	Sentence awarded
1.	325 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months and to pay fine of Rs.1500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 15 days.
2.	323 IPC	To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three months and to pay fine of Rs.500/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 days.

3. 341 IPC To undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month and to pay fine of Rs.200/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 5 days.

31. Fine has been paid. All the sentences shall run concurrently. The period already undergone by the convicts during enquiry, investigation and trial of the case be set off against the substantive sentence. Case property, if any, be disposed of under rules after the expiry of period of appeal/ revision and subject to decision thereof. File be consigned to the record room, after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court:
Dated: 16.9.2021.
SATISH KUMAR

Raman Sharma,
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.
UID No. PB-0251.

