



CRR-559-2021

-1-

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

255

CRR-559-2021

Date of decision : 22.04.2026

SANJAY SHARMA

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Tarun Hooda, Advocate and
Mr. Abhishek Kharb, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This revision petition has been filed against the judgment dated 10.03.2021 passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari vide which the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 03.11.2016 passed by Id. Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rewari was upheld whereby the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo as under:-

Under Section 279 IPC	RI for six months and to pay fine of Rs. 500/- and in default of payment of fine to undergo further RI for three months.
Under Section 304-A IPC	RI for two years and to pay fine of Rs. 1000/- and in default of payment of fine to undergo further RI for three months

All the sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

**CRR-559-2021****-2-**

2. The case of the prosecution that a telephonic intimation was received at Apex Hospital, Dharuhera regarding injuries sustained by Balwant in a roadside accident. Acting on the said information, ASI Karan Singh, along with other police officials, reached the hospital and obtained the medico-legal report (MLR) of Balwant, who had been declared dead by the attending doctor. At the hospital, Ami Lal met the police officials and made a statement to the effect that at about 4:00 p.m., while he was returning to his home in Malpura in a tempo, and when the vehicle crossed the Housing Board cut, two persons on a motorcycle coming from Gurgaon towards Dharuhera, was hit from behind by a bus being driven at a high speed in a rash and negligent manner. As a result, both riders fell and sustained injuries. Upon reaching the spot along with his co-passenger Om Parkash, he identified the injured persons as Balwant and his son Pawan. Both the injured succumbed to the injuries in the hospital while the driver of the offending bus bearing registration No. HR-55B-7117 fled the scene, leaving the vehicle behind. On the basis of the said statement, an FIR under Sections 279 and 304-A IPC was registered, and investigation was initiated. During the course of investigation, accused Sanjay was arrested and produced before the Court to face trial.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is not assailing the impugned judgment of conviction on merits and restricts his prayer qua modification of the order on quantum of sentence. He also contends that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of 02 months and 13 days out of the awarded sentence. He prays that since FIR in question pertains to the year 2012, a lenient view may be taken while passing an order on quantum by this Court.



CRR-559-2021

-3-

4. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioner and has filed the custody certificate in the Court, which is taken on record. He further submits that the Courts below have passed well reasoned judgments based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. He submits that the petitioner is involved in one more case but has been released on bail in that case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. The FIR in the present case pertains to the year 2012 and to the petitioner has already faced the rigors of the trial for more than 13 years.

7. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in "***Deo Narain Mandal Vs. State of UP***", (2004) 7 SCC 257, has held that awarding of sentence is not a mere formality in criminal cases. When a minimum and maximum term is prescribed by the statute with regard to the period of sentence, a discretionary element is vested in the Court. Background of each case, which includes factors like gravity of the offence, the manner in which the offence is committed, age of the petitioner, should be considered while determining the quantum of sentence and this discretion is not to be used arbitrarily or whimsically. After assessing all relevant factors, proper sentence should be awarded bearing in mind the principle of proportionality to ensure the sentence is neither excessively harsh nor does it come across as lenient.

8. Further, a Division Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ravada Sasikala Vs. State of AP***, AIR 2017 SC 1166, has held that the imposition of sentence also serves a social purpose, as it acts as a deterrent by making the accused realise the damage caused not only to the victim, but also



CRR-559-2021

-4-

to the society at large. The law in this regard is well settled that opportunities of reformation must be granted and such discretion is to be exercised by evaluating all attending circumstances of each case by noticing the nature of the crime, the manner, in which the crime was committed and conduct of the accused to strike a balance between the efficacy of law and the chances of reformation of the accused.

9. A perusal of the judgment of conviction passed by the Courts below indicates no perversity in their findings and the same are based on correct appreciation of evidence available on record. However, learned counsel for the petitioner has not assailed the judgments, rather restricted the prayer only qua modification of quantum of sentence to that of the sentence already undergone by the petitioner.

10. As far as the question of quantum of sentence is concerned, it is worthwhile to note that the occurrence in this case pertains to the year 2012. The right to speedy and expeditious trial is one of the most valuable and cherished rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The petitioner has already suffered the agony of protracted trial, spanning over a period of more than 13 years and has been in the corridors of the court for this prolonged period. In view of the facts noted above, the case of the petitioner deserves to be dealt with leniency. The petitioner also deserves the benefit of the consistent view taken by this court in this regard. Thus, guided by the judicial pronouncements made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of *Haripada Das Vs. State of West Bangal* reported in (1998) 9 SCC 678 and *Alister Anthony Pereira vs. [2023:RJ-JD:28174] (5 of 5) [CRLR-755/2003] State of Maharashtra reported in 2012 2 SCC 648* and considering the facts and circumstances of the



CRR-559-2021

-5-

case, age of petitioner, his status in the society and the fact that he faced financial hardship and had to go through mental agony, this court is of the view that ends of justice would be met, if sentence imposed upon the petitioner is reduced to the period as already undergone by him.

11. Accordingly, judgments passed by the Id. Appellate Court as well as Id. Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rewari are hereby affirmed but the quantum of sentence awarded by the Courts concerned under Sections 304-A and 279 IPC has been modified and reduced to the period of sentence as already undergone by him. The petitioner is on bail. He need not surrender. His bail bonds are discharged. However, the petitioner is directed to pay a sum of Rs. 20,000/- as compensation to the LR's of the each deceased within a period of two months. In case of non-deposit of compensation awarded within the stipulated period the trial court is directed to initiate the proceedings to recover the same from the petitioner in accordance with law.

12. With these modifications, the present revision petition is disposed of.

13. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

22.04.2026

*renu***(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No