

\234

Cr1.A.No. 1249 OF 2003  
ITEM No.108

Court No.11

SECTION IIA

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Criminal Appeal No.1249 of 2003.

VEER SINGH Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH Respondent (s)  
[With office report]

WITH  
CRL.APPEAL NO.1080/2003  
[With applns.for bail & with office report]

Date : 24/02/2004 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.N. AGRAWAL  
HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE AR. LAKSHMANAN

For Appellant (s)Dr.TN Singh,Sr.Adv.  
M/s Lakhan Singh,Anil Shrivastav,Advs.

For Respondent (s)Ms.Vibha Datta Makhija,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

Heard the learned counsel for the parties for some time.  
The appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

[Naresh Kumar]  
AR-cum-PS

[Kanwal Singh]  
Court Master

[Signed order is placed on the file.]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1249 OF 2003

VEER SINGH  
...  
APPELLANT (S)

VERSUS

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH  
...  
RESPONDENT (S)

WITH

O R D E R

Heard the parties.

The appellants of these appeals were tried for offence under Section 302 of the Penal Code and the trial court while acquitting the other appellants of all the charges convicted appellant Veer Singh under Section 302, I.P.C. and he was sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life. Against the order of conviction Veer Singh preferred an appeal before the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Gwalior Bench whereas against the order of acquittal State of Madhya Pradesh filed an appeal. The High Court has dismissed the appeal filed by Veer Singh but allowed the appeal filed by the State convicting all the three acquitted accused persons under Section 302 read with Section 34 of the Penal Code and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life and these accused were further convicted under Section 323 read with Section 34 of the Penal Code but no separate sentence has been awarded. Hence these appeals by special leave. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record we are of the opinion that it is not a case for interference. Accordingly, the appeals are dismissed.

.....J.  
( B.N. AGRAWAL )

.....J.  
New Delhi, ( Dr.AR. LAKSHMANAN )  
February 24, 2004.