



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

114

CRA-S-2059-SB-2005 (O&M)

Decided on: 10.07.2026

Kuldeep Singh

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI

Present: - Mr. Ishan Thakur, Advocate for
Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant was apprehended with 23.2 kilograms of poppy straw in his conscious possession in the area of Police Station Sadar, Mansa on 21.08.2001. Such apprehension led to his arrest in FIR No.70 dated 21.08.2001 under Section 15 of the Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for brevity, '1985 Act'). On conclusion of investigation against him in the said FIR, a final report was presented before the concerned Court. He faced a trial in the said FIR. Through a judgment of conviction dated 14.10.2005 and order of that very day, he was convicted under Section 15 of the 1985 Act and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for nine months and also to pay a fine of Rs.2000/-. In default of payment of fine, he was further ordered to



undergo rigorous imprisonment for two months. He has filed the present appeal against the said conviction and sentence.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant makes a statement at Bar that he has been instructed by the appellant to state before this Court that the appellant does not challenge the impugned judgment of conviction but leniency may be shown to him in the matter of imposition of sentence. He also states that out of total imprisonment of nine months, the appellant has already undergone a substantive sentence of six months and eighteen days without remission and the appellant will pay the fine imposed on him in due course.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed his such prayer but has filed a custody certificate showing that the appellant has undergone six months and eighteen days in custody out of the total sentence of nine months. He also states that the appellant has not paid the imposed fine.

4. The occurrence in question is stated to have taken place on 21.08.2001. At the time of passing the judgment by the concerned Court, the appellant Kuldeep Singh was aged 25 years. A period of more than 24 years has elapsed since the date of occurrence. The appellant has already undergone protracted criminal proceedings. Custody certificate filed today shows that he has no other case registered against him. No previous conviction has also been shown against him in the same.

5. In view thereof, I find the present matter to be a fit one for reducing the sentence imposed on the appellant to the period already undergone. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of conviction is confirmed but the sentence imposed on the appellant is reduced to the



period already undergone by him in the present case. However, the sentence of payment of fine is maintained.

6. The present appeal is partly allowed in the above stated terms.

All the interim application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

10.07.2026
Gaurav

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No