

## Raghunath and Others Vs State of Haryana

**Court:** High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

**Date of Decision:** Sept. 13, 2007

**Acts Referred:** Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) â€” Section 149, 323

**Citation:** (2007) 24 CriminalCC 614

**Hon'ble Judges:** A.N. Jindal, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Advocate:** Nand Lal Sammi, for the Appellant; K.S. Godara, DAG, for the Respondent

**Final Decision:** Dismissed

### Judgement

A.N. Jindal, J.

Assailed in this petition is the order dated 14.2.1995 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jagadhri, dismissing

the appeal against the order dated 08.01.1993 of conviction under Sections 323/325/149 IPC passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st

Class, Jagadhri.

2. In nut-shell, the facts in brief which culminated into trial against the petitioners are that on 27.09.1986 at about 7.00 A.M., Rashmi Devi

daughter in law of complainant-Shiv Ram (hereinafter referred to as ""the complainant""), was present in the street, Lakhvir petitioner hit her by his

bicycle, as a result of which some altercation took place, which attracted complainant, his son Sohan Lal, Jee Ram and niece Karmi and the

petitioner Raghunath. Raghunath inflicted fist blows on the face of the complainant and in the meantime Jagdish Ram, Pannu Ram, Ramesh also

reached at the spot and inflicted injuries to the complainant party. Raghunath and Jagdish petitioners caused injuries to the complainant with fist

blows and lathi blows. Jagdish further inflicted injuries to Sohan Lal with lathi, Ramesh caused injuries to Jee Ram with lathi and Miss Karmi also

received injuries at the hands of the petitioners. On the basis of the aforesaid statement Ex.PA, FIR Ex.PWI 1/F was registered. Investigation was

commenced which was followed by a report u/s 173 Cr.P.C.

3. Formal charge under Sections 323/325/149 IPC was framed against the petitioners, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

4. On commencement of the trial, the prosecution examined Shiv Ram PW1, Jee Ram PW2, Sohan Lal PW3, Reshmi PW4, Ranjit Singh PW5,

Surta Ram PW6, Dr. Subhash Chand Goel PW7, B.S. Sharma PW8, Dr. Arun Chaudhary PW9, Dr. R.S. Garg PW10 and H.C. Avtar Singh

PW11.

5. When examined u/s 313 Cr.P.C. the petitioners denied all the incriminating circumstances appearing against them and pleaded their false

implication in the case. However, no evidence was led in defence.

6. The trial ended in conviction. Appeal against the said order was also dismissed. Hence this revision petition.

7. Without challenging the judgment of conviction, the learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that it would not be appropriate or fair in

the proper administration of justice to send the petitioners in jail after more than 20 years particularly when as per his contentions, the petitioners

have not repeated any such offence till date. Moreover, they have already undergone one month and 15 days of the substantive sentence.

8. Having deliberated over the aforesaid contentions, since the sword of sentence remained hanging over the head of the petitioners since the year

1986 till date and they have already suffered a lot on account of the criminal proceedings pending against them and they have already undergone

one month and fifteen days of sentence, therefore, I do not find any justification to send them again in the jail in the peculiar circumstances of the

case and a lenient view deserves to be taken in their favour.

9. Consequently, while dismissing the revision petition, the sentence passed against the petitioners is modified to the extent that they be released on

probation for a period of one year, on furnishing their personal bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of the like amount each u/s 4(1)

of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958. They are directed to keep peace and be of good behaviour during this period and in case of breach of

the terms of the bonds, the petitioners will be ready to serve the sentence as and when called for.