

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(s).3635/2003

(From the judgement and order dated 21/12/2001 in CRLA No. 1014/1997 of The HIGH COURT OF
A.P AT HYDERABAD)

STATE OF A.P.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

B. VENKATA RATNAM & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and office report)

(For final disposal)

Date: 04/08/2006 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.G. BALAKRISHNAN

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.K. JAIN

For Petitioner(s)

Mrs.D. Bharathi Reddy,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Abhijit Sengupta,Adv.

Mr. V. Sridhar Reddy, Adv.

Ms.T.Anamika ,Adv

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Delay condoned.

Leave granted.

The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed
order.

(R.K. DHAWAN)

(VEERA VERMA

COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.818 OF 2006

(Arising out of SLP(Crl.) No.3635/2003)

STATE OF A.P.

.. APPELLANT.

..

VERSUS

VENKATA RATNAM & ANR.

.. RESPONDENTS.

..

O R D E R

Delay condoned.

Leave granted.

This is an appeal preferred by the State against the sentence awarded

to the

present respondents. The first respondent was convicted by the trial court for the offence

punishable under Section 326 IPC and was sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 7 years

and the second respondent was convicted for the offence punishable under Section 324 IPC

and was sentenced to imprisonment for 2 years. The High Court, by the impugned

judgment, confirmed the conviction but reduced the sentence to the period already

undergone. The counsel for the State submits that the period already undergone was only

few months which is not sufficient to meet the ends of justice. We have gone through the

facts of the case and it appears that there was a piercing wound on the left leg of the victim

and it shows that it was a spindle shaped incised wound of the size of 5 x 1 ½ inches

causing extensive injuries on the

...2/-

-2-

blood vessels. We are of the view that the High Court was not justified in reducing the

sentence of the first respondent. We make it clear that we confirm the sentence of the first

respondent under Section 326 IPC and hold that he shall undergo imprisonment for a

period of one year. If he has already undergone imprisonment for one year, he need not

surrender, otherwise the Sessions Judge shall take steps to see that first respondent shall

undergo the remaining period of sentence. As regard the second respondent, we find no

reason to interfere.

The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

.....J

.....

(K.G. BALAKRISHNAN)

.....J

.....

(D.K. JAIN)

NEW DELHI;

AUGUST 4, 2006.