

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 3009/2001

(From the judgement and order dated 11/08/2000 in SBCMP 588/2000  
of The HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN AT JAIPUR)

UNION OF INDIA

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

ATAR SINGH & ANR.

Respondent (s)

( With Appln(s)for stay,c/delay in filing SLP& for c/delay in refiling  
SLP and exemption from filing O.T. )

Date : 29/10/2001 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.B. PATTANAIAK  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RUMA PAL

For Petitioner (s)

Mr. Altaf Ahmed,ASG  
Mr. Rajeev Sharma & Mr.P.Parmeshwaran,Adv.  
Mr. D.S. Mahra,Adv.

For Respondent No.1

Mr. Jagdeep Dhankhar,Sr.Adv.  
Dr. Sushil Balwada and  
Mr. Devendra Singh,Adv

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

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.  
.SP2

Leave granted.  
The appeal is disposed of.

.SP1

(Y.P.Dhamija) (Suneet Bala Sharma)@@  
AA  
Court Master Court Master@@  
AAAA

Signed order is placed on the file.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.1086/2001@@  
EEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE  
(arising out of SLP(CRL) No. 3009/2001)

Union of India ...Appellant

Vs

Atar Singh & Anr. ...Respondents

O R D E R@@  
EEEEEEEEEE

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J  
.SP2

Leave granted.

This appeal is directed against the impugned order of the High Court. The respondent accused, who has been convicted under section 409, IPC and section 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, preferred an appeal to the High Court, which has been entertained. On an application being filed under section 389 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the High Court has suspended the conviction solely on the ground that the non-suspension of conviction may entail removal of the delinquent Government servant from service.

Learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the Union of India contends that the High Court totally erred in exercising its discretionary power under section 389 by suspending the conviction, and in support of the same reliance has been placed in the judgment of K.C.Sareen Vs.@@

EEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE

CBI,Chandigarh JT 2001 (6) SC 59. The learned counsel for the@@  
EEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE

respondents, on the other hand, contended that the discretion conferred on the High Court under section 389 having been duly

- 2 -

exercised, the same need not be interfered with by this Court in exercise of power under section 136 of the Constitution. The learned counsel placed reliance on the 3-Judge Bench decision in the case of Rama Narang Vs. Ramesh Narang & Ors.@@

EE

1995 (2) SCC 513 as well as the Constitution Bench decision of this Court in G.S.Sibbia & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab 1980 (2)@@

EE

SCC 565 wherein the Court was considering the question as to advisability of issuing of certain directions and guidelines for being exercised by the High Court or the Sessions Judge while entertaining and deciding an application under section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. It cannot be doubted that section 389 confers a discretion on the Appellate Court to decide the question of suspension of a conviction in a given case. But, if in exercise of that discretion, the Court suspends a conviction, it would always be open for this Court to examine the correctness of exercising of that discretion and pass appropriate orders, in the event, this Court comes to a conclusion that the discretion had not been appropriately

