

**Dalbir Singh vs.state**

**Dalbir Singh vs.state**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/1209712](http://sooperkanoon.com/1209712)

**Court :** Delhi

**Decided On :** Oct-13-2017

**Appellant :** Dalbir Singh

**Respondent :** State

**Judgement :**

\* % + IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI Judgment dated:

13. h October, 2017 CRL.REV.P. 394/2017 & CRL.M.(Bail) 991/2017 DALBIR SINGH .....

... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Gigi C George, Adv. STATE versus Through: Mr.Raghuvinder Varma, APP for ..... Respondent State with SI Amit Mann, PS-Defence Colony CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.S.MEHTA JUDGMENT I.S. MEHTA, J.

1. The instant revision petition is preferred by the petitioner under Sections Cr.P.C. for setting aside the impugned judgment dated 28.04.2017 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-02, South-East, Saket Courts, New Delhi in criminal appeal No.204266/2016, conviction judgment dated 26.11.2015 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate- 09, South-East District, Saket, New Delhi and order on sentence dated 09.02.2016 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate-09, South-East District, Saket, New Delhi in FIR No.1 titled as State Vs. Dalbir Singh. CRL.REV.P. 394/2017 & CRL.M.(Bail) 991/2017

Page 1 of 5 2. Brief facts stated are that on 15.12.2013, information regarding an accident was received by SI Rakesh Kumar vide DD No.20-A. Thereafter, he alongwith Ct.Manoj reached the spot where they met the complainant, Mr.Vinod Gupta who got his statement recorded and on the basis of his statement, FIR No.1 was registered. After completion of investigation, charge-sheet was filed and the petitioner was charged for committing an offence punishable under Sections 279/304-A IPC. The prosecution examined 7 witnesses in order to prove its case.

3. Thereafter, the learned Metropolitan Magistrate after appreciation of the evidence and after considering the contentions of the parties, vide judgment dated 26.11.2015 convicted the petitioner for the offence committed under Sections 279/304-A IPC and vide separate order on sentence dated 09.02.2016 sentenced the petitioner to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months for offence under Section 279 IPC and eight months rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,000/- for the offence under Section 304-A IPC and in default of payment of fine, the petitioner shall undergo simple imprisonment for a further period of five days, however, the said sentences shall run concurrently.

4. Aggrieved from the said judgment of conviction dated 26.11.2015 and order on sentence dated 09.02.2016 the petitioner filed an appeal before the Court of learned District & Sessions Judge, Saket Courts, New Delhi and the learned Additional Sessions Judge-02, South-East, Saket Courts, New Delhi upheld the conviction judgment dated 26.11.2015 and order on sentence dated 09.02.2016; vide impugned judgment dated 28.04.2017 in criminal appeal No.204266/2016. CRL.REV.P. 394/2017 & CRL.M.(Bail) 991/2017 Page 2 of 5 5. Aggrieved and dissatisfied by the aforesaid impugned judgment dated 28.04.2017 the petitioner has preferred the instant revision petition.

6. During the course of arguments, on instructions, the learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that the petitioner has opted not to challenge the findings of the learned Trial Court on conviction. He, however, prays to modify the order on sentence and to release the petitioner for the period already undergone by him.

7. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that sentence awarded to the

petitioner is just and adequate.

8. Since the petitioner has given up to challenge the findings on conviction and there is ample evidence to base conviction, therefore, the conviction of the petitioner for the aforesaid offences stands affirmed.

9. On the quantum of sentence, the learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is not a previous convict and belongs to a poor family and that the sentence given by the learned Trial Court is too harsh. It is further submitted that the appellant was awarded imprisonment for 8 months and he has already undergone more than 7 months imprisonment including remission.

10. In *B. G. Goswami vs Delhi Administration*; 1973 AIR1457 1974 SCR (1) 222 the Honble Supreme Court while dealing with the quantum on sentence has observed that:-

"Now the question of sentence is always a difficult question, requiring as it does, proper adjustment CRL.REV.P. 394/2017 & CRL.M.(Bail) 991/2017 Page 3 of 5 and balancing of various considerations, which weigh with a judicial mind in determining its appropriate quantum in a given case. The main purpose of the sentence broadly stated is that the accused must realise that he has committed an act. which is not only harmful to the society of which he forms an integral part but is also harmful to his own future, both as an individual and as a member of the society. Punishment is designed to protect society by deterring potential offenders as also by preventing the guilty party from repeating the offence; it is also designed to reform the offender and reclaim him as a law abiding citizen for the good of the society as a whole. Reformatory, deterrent and punitive aspects of punishment thus play their due part in judicial thinking while determining this question. In modern civilized societies, however, reformatory aspect is being given somewhat greater importance. Too lenient as well as too harsh sentences both lose their efficaciousness. One does not deter and the other may the offender a hardened criminal. In the present case, after weighing the considerations already noticed by us and the fact that to send the appellant back to jail now after 7 years of the annoy and harassment of these proceedings when he is also going to lose his job and to earn a living for himself and for his family members and for those

dependent on him, we feel that it would meet the ends of justice if we reduce the sentence of imprisonment to that already undergone but increase the sentence of fine from Rs- 200/- to Rs. 400/-. Period of imprisonment in case of default will remain the same. thereby making frustrate 11. The nominal roll dated 14.08.2017 reflects that the petitioner has already undergone 3 months and 17 days incarceration as on 14.08.2017. The unexpired portion of sentence was 4 months and 5 days on that date. CRL.REV.P. 394/2017 & CRL.M.(Bail) 991/2017 Page 4 of 5 12. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the substantive period already undergone by the petitioner in this case and the fact that he is the sole bread earner of his family and has to support his dependants, i.e. his wife and children, and he has realized the mistake committed by him and is remorseful of his act to the society to which he belongs and now he wants to transform himself as well as to the society to a right direction, therefore, I am of the considered opinion that he should be given a chance to reform himself and his better contribution in the society to which he belongs to.

13. Consequently, the order on sentence is modified and the period already undergone by him in this case, i.e. 5 months and 15 days, is taken as his substantive sentence for the offence committed under Sections 279/304- A IPC.

14. The present revision petition stands disposed of in the above terms. All pending application(s) also stand disposed of. Trial Court record be sent back forthwith along with a copy of the judgment. One copy of the judgment be sent to the Superintendent of Jail for necessary compliance. I.S.MEHTA, J OCTOBER13 2017 CRL.REV.P. 394/2017 & CRL.M.(Bail) 991/2017 Page 5 of 5

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com**