

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.32 OF 2005

JAGRAJ SINGH & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for impleadment as party respondent and office report)

Date: 22/01/2008 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. AGRAWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AFTAB ALAM

For Appellant(s) Ms. Amita Gupta,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Kuldip Singh,Adv.

For Intervenor(s): Ms. Kamini Jaiswal,Adv

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The criminal appeal is dismissed.

[T.I. Rajput]
A.R.-cum-P.S.

[Ramesh Joshi]
Court Master

[Signed order is placed on the file]
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.32 OF 2005

Jagraj Singh and Ors.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The Trial Court, upon conclusion of trial, acquitted accused Harkamal Singh, Jagpal Singh and Rajwinder Singh whereas convicted the appellants herein, except Gurpreet Singh, under Section 366 of the Indian Penal Code [for short, "I.P.C."] and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of seven years and to pay fine of Rs.1000/-; in default, to undergo further imprisonment for a period of one month. All the four appellants were convicted under Section 376(2)(g) I.P.C. and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of ten years and to pay fine of Rs.1000/-; in default, to undergo further imprisonment for a period of one month. They were then convicted under Section 302 read with Section 34 I.P.C. and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay fine of Rs.1000/-; in default, to undergo further imprisonment for a period of one month. Lastly, they were convicted under Section 201 read

....2/-

-2-

with Section 34 I.P.C. and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years and to pay fine of Rs.500/-; in default, to undergo further imprisonment for a period of one month. Against the order of acquittal, the appeal was filed by the State whereas private prosecutor filed a revision application. The appellants preferred appeal against their convictions. The High Court, by the impugned judgement, dismissed the appeal against the order of acquittal filed by the State and the revision application. The convictions of the appellants have been upheld by dismissing their appeal. Hence, this appeal by special leave.

Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants and perused the records, we are of the view that the Trial Court as well as the High Court have recorded convictions of the appellants upon detailed consideration of evidence and no interference by this Court is called for.

The appeal, accordingly, fails and the same is dismissed.

.....J.
[B.N. AGRAWAL]

.....J.
[AFTAB ALAM]

New Delhi,
January 22, 2008.