



2026:PHHC:063262



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

212

CRR 1815 of 2010

Date of Decision: 22.04.2026

Bikram Singh @ Jugnu

...Petitioner (s)

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. J.S. Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Amit Rana, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present revision petition against the impugned judgment dated 26.05.2010 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Rupnagar, whereby the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.02.2009 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ropar, were modified. The petitioner was held guilty for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 323 read with Section 34 IPC, 341 read with Section 34 IPC, 325 and 325 read with Section 34 IPC, while he was acquitted of the charge under Section 324 IPC, and was sentenced as under:—

“(1) To pay a fine of Rs.500/- and in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month each for the offence under section 341 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

(2) To undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month each for the offence under Section 323 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.



(3) To undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and pay a fine of Rs.500/-and in default to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for one month each for the offence under Section 325 and Section 325 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code”.

2. Brief facts of the case of prosecution are that complainant Parvinder Singh reported to police that on 01.11.2003 he along with Sadhu Singh was going to village Amrali for purchase of buffaloes and when they reached at about 01.30 p.m. near village Lutheri, then, they found three persons riding on one scooter and three others riding on the motorcycle. Both the scooter and motorcycle were coming from opposite direction. Motorcycle was driven by petitioner Bikram Singh. All the assailants stopped their vehicles in front of the scooter of the complainant on road and, thereafter, injuries inflicted with sticks on complainant. Bikram Singh gave stick blow on head of the complainant, as a result of which, he fell on the ground. Thereafter, more stick blows given by Bikram Singh petitioner hit on legs and other parts of body of complainant. On alarm being raised by complainant, assailants fled away from the spot after administering threats to kill the complainant in future. Sadhu Singh after arranging for vehicle took the complainant in injured condition to Civil Hospital, Morinda for treatment. After recording statement, endorsement made, on which FIR was registered. Spot was inspected and site plan of place of occurrence was prepared. Copies of MLR of complainant also obtained. Petitioners were arrested and thereafter, on completion of investigation, *challan* against the petitioner presented.



3. After the presentation of *challan*, the petitioner was charge-sheeted for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 325 and 341 read with Section 34, to which, he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

4. In order to prove its case, the prosecution has examined Parwinder Singh (complainant) as PW1, Dr. R.S. Bhatia as PW2, ASI Sadhu Singh as PW3, ASI Darshan Singh as PW4, Dr. Rishi as PW5, H.C. Sukhdev Singh as PW6 and ASI Ram Sarup as PW7 and thereafter the evidence of the prosecution was closed.

5. After closure of the evidence, the statement of the petitioner was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and he denied all the incriminating evidence put to him and stated that he has been falsely involved in the present case. No evidence was led in defence.

6. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not wish to challenge the judgement of conviction passed against the petitioner by the trial Court, however, some leniency may be shown while awarding the sentence on him. Even though, learned counsel for the petitioner has not challenged the judgement of conviction, still, this Court has considered the case on merits.

7. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner does not deserve the concession regarding sentence and the present revision petition be dismissed.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.



9. In the present case, the prosecution examined PW1 Parwinder Singh, complainant, who supported the case of the prosecution in totality. The prosecution further examined PW2 Dr. R.S. Bhatia, who had proved the medical legal reports in the present case. The prosecution further examined PW3 ASI Sadhu Singh and PW4 ASI Darshan Singh, who had proved the investigation in the present case. Still further, the prosecution examined PW6 HC Sukhdev Singh, who recorded the statement of PW1 in civil hospital and on the basis of the said statement, the FIR was registered in the present case. Still further, PW5 Dr. Rishi had declared the injury on the head of PW1 Parwinder Singh as grievous in nature. Apart from that, burn injury on the left tibia was also found to be grievous by PW5 Dr. Rishi. As such, the offence under Section 325 stood proved. Still further, in the present case, there was sufficient evidence to show that the petitioners had committed the offence punishable under Sections 323, 325, 341, and 34 IPC. Even otherwise, I have carefully gone through the judgments passed by both the Courts and find that the same do not suffer from any infirmity, illegality, or perversity. Accordingly, the impugned judgment of convictions are ordered to be upheld.

10. Now adverting to the order on quantum of sentence, this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the petitioner is facing the agony of trial/appeal since 01.11.2003, i.e., for the last about 22 years. As per his custody certificate, the petitioner has already undergone more than 02 months of actual custody out of maximum sentence of 01 year. The sentence imposed on the petitioner was suspended by this Court on



28.07.2010 and in the more than 15 years, he has maintained good conduct. Consequently, keeping in view the aforesaid mitigating circumstances, the sentence imposed on him is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

11. With the above modifications, the present revision petition is partly allowed and the impugned judgment dated 26.05.2010 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Rupnagar, is upheld, whereas, the sentence imposed on the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him. However, the sentence of fine will remain the same.

12. Pending applications, if any, stand also disposed of, accordingly.

22.04.2026
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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