

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Cr1. Appeal No. 1257 of 2003

Sukhwinder Singh & Anr.

...

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...

Respondent (s)

(With appln.(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and bail and with office report)

Date : 23/03/2004 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

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

For Appellant (s) Mr. Bhupender Yadav, Adv.
Ms. Babita Yadav, Adv.
Mr. R.C.Kohli, Adv.

For Respondent (s)Mr. Bimal Roy Jad, Adv.
Ms. Sunita Pandit, Adv.

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

The criminal appeal is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

(Shashi Sareen)
Court Master

(Gyan Bhatia)
Court Master

(Signed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.1257 OF 2003

SUKHVINDER SINGH & ANR.

...

Appellant (s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...

Respondent (s)

O R D E R

Heard the parties. The appellants were convicted by the trial court under section 15 of Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act (for short "the NDPS Act") and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 years and to pay a fine of Rs. 1 Lakh each, in default to undergo further imprisonment for a period of one year. The sentences, however, were to run concurrently. On appeal being preferred, the High Court of Punjab and Haryana upheld the conviction. Hence this appeal by special leave.

We have been taken through the impugned judgment and the evidence of three seizure witnesses namely Pws 2,3 and 5. We do not find any infirmity in the evidence of these witnesses on the point of seizure. The High Court has upheld the conviction after due discussion of evidence in detail and we do not find any infirmity therein as such it is not possible to interfere with the same. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

.....J.

(B.N.AGRAWAL)

.....J.

(DR. AR. LAKSHMANAN)

New Delhi,
MARCH 23, 2004.