HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 408/2007
CNR: RJHC020144772007 | URN: CRLR / 792U / 2007

Munna Khan S/o Ramzan Khan, Resident of Nagauri Mohalla, Dausa.

----Accused Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan through PP

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Ram Prasad Sharma, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vivek Choudhary, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BHUWAN GOYAL

Judgment

08/09/2026

1. The present revision petition under Section 397 read with Section 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed by the accused-petitioner against Judgment and Order dated 25.4.2007 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Bandikui, District Dausa (for short, 'the appellate court') in Criminal Appeal No. 6/2007 (Munna Khan Vs. State of Rajasthan) vide which the appellate court while dismissing the appeal qua conviction of the accused-petitioner for the offence under Sections 279 and 337 IPC, as awarded by Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Sikrai, District Dausa (for short, 'the trial court') vide its judgment and order dated 13.2.2007 passed in Case No. 1453/1992 titled State of Rajasthan Versus Munna Khan, as mentioned below, modified his sentence for the offence under Section 304A IPC as under:

Offence	Punishment	Punishment awarded

	awarded by the trial court	by the appellate Court
U/s. 279 IPC	To undergo 3 months' SI	Maintained the punishment awarded by the trial court
U/s. 337 IPC	To undergo 3 months' SI	Maintained the punishment awarded by the trial court
U/s. 304A IPC	To undergo 1 years' SI with a fine of Rs. 1000/-, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo 15 days' SI	To undergo 6 months' SI with a fine of Rs. 5000/-; in default of payment of fine, to further undergo 1 month's SI

2. Facts of the case in short are that on 22.1.1992, Jai Ram S/o Birdhi Chand submitted a report to SHO, Police Station, Bandikui, District Dausa to the effect that on that day at about 9.00 AM he was going from his village to Sikandra in Jeep No. RJ 14 TO 265. Near Girdharpura, the driver of the Jeep drove it rashly and negligently and dashed against a tree, due to which he alongwith other passengers sitting inside the jeep sustained injuries. On that basis, FIR No. 21/1992 was registered for the offence under Sections 279 and 337 IPC. During treatment, injured Mool Chand died. After completing the investigation, the police submitted challan against accused petitioner Munna Khan for the offence under Sections 279, 337 and 304A IPC. Cognizance was taken and substance of allegations were readover to him. He denied the same and claimed for trial. After conclusion of trial, the trial court passed judgment and order dated 13.2.2007 convicting and sentencing the petitioner for the offence under Sections 279, 337 and 304-A IPC, as indicated above. Thereafter, the petitioner filed an appeal and the appellate court vide its judgment and order

dated 25.4.2007 while dismissing the appeal qua conviction and sentence of the petitioner for the offence under Section 279 and 337 IPC modified his sentence for the offence under Section 304A IPC, as mentioned above. Hence, this criminal revision petition has been preferred by the accused-petitioner.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

4. After arguing the matter on merits at some length, learned counsel for the accused-petitioner does not want to press instant revision petition challenging judgments passed by the courts below qua conviction and prefers to make submissions on the point of sentence only.

5. Learned counsel for the accused-petitioner has submitted that incident in the present case took place way back in the year 1992 i.e. around 33 years ago; accused-petitioner was 27 years of age at the time of incident and now he is around 60 years old and facing agony of trial for the past about 33 years; accused-petitioner who is sole bread earner in the family, belongs to poor strata of society and remained in police and judicial custody for a period of 32 days and there is no previous conviction recorded against the accused-petitioner, therefore, he prays that ends of justice would meet if a lenient view is taken in the matter and sentence of imprisonment awarded to the accused-petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

6. Learned counsel for the accused-petitioner has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Chander Shekhar vs. State of Rajasthan (Criminal Appeal No. 4161/2024) decided on 04.10.2024*** *and the judgments rendered by a*

coordinate Bench of this Court in the cases of ***Shyamveer Singh vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 724/2003) decided on 15.05.2024, Smt. Sudesh Kumari vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 1047/2005) decided on 09.10.2024, Mahesh Bhargava vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 737/2005) decided on 06.11.2024, Pappu vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 538/2005) decided on 21.08.2024, Annu @ Anwar vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Writ Petition No. 333/2018) decided on 04.11.2024, Banna Ram vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 391 of 2006) decided on 08.07.2024, Heera Lal vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 733/2003) decided on 14.02.2024 & Ram Karan vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 972 of 2006) decided on 08.07.2024.***

7. Per contra, learned PP while opposing the revision petition, submits that looking to the overall facts and circumstances of the case and the well reasoned speaking judgments passed by the courts below, sentence awarded by the trial court and modified by the appellate court cannot be said to be disproportionate, therefore, no interference in sentence is warranted in this case.

8. I have considered the arguments advanced at the Bar and have gone through judgments passed by both the courts below and record of the case.

9. Since the revision petition against conviction of the accused-petitioner is not pressed on merits and after perusing the record, nothing is noticed which requires interference in the finding of guilt reached by the courts below. This Court does not wish to interfere in the judgments passed by courts below qua conviction of the accused-petitioner. Accordingly, the judgments passed by the courts below qua conviction of the accused-petitioner are maintained.

10. As far as quantum of sentence is concerned, after perusing judgments and orders impugned, considering the submissions of learned counsel for the parties; precedent law on the issue; accused-petitioner, who was only 27 years of age at the time of incident, has already suffered the agony of protracted trial, spanning over a period of more than 33 years and he remained incarcerated for some time after passing of the judgment, and no evidence regarding previous conviction of the accused-petitioner is produced on record, reformative theory of punishment is in vogue in our country, a balanced and pragmatic approach is required while considering the question of sentence, and the fact that now if the petitioner is sent in jail, the petitioner's family will not only suffer adversely but they will face financial hardship also, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served while sending him behind the bars at this stage.

11. This Court is conscious of the judgments rendered in ***Alister Anthony Pareira Vs. State of Maharashtra : (2012) 2 SCC 648*** and ***Haripada Das Vs. State of W.B. : (1998) 9 SCC 678***, wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:-

Alister Anthony Pareira (Supra)
"There is no straitjacket formula for sentencing an accused on proof of crime. The courts have evolved certain principles: twin objective of the sentencing policy is deterrence and correction. What sentence would meet the ends of justice depends on the facts and circumstances of each case and the court must keep in mind the gravity of the crime, motive for the crime, nature of the offence and all other attendant circumstances."

Haripada Das (Supra)
"…considering the fact that the respondent had already undergone detention for some period and the case is pending for a pretty long time for which he had suffered both financial hardship and mental agony and also considering the fact that he had been released on bail as far back as on 17-1-1986, we feel that the ends of justice will be met in the facts of the case if the sentence is reduced to the period already undergone…"

12. Consequently, the judgment and order dated 25.4.2007 passed by the appellate court and the judgment and order dated 13.2.2007 passed by the trial court qua conviction of the accused-petitioner for the offence under Sections 279, 337 and 304-A of I.P.C. are affirmed but the quantum of sentence awarded to the accused-petitioner by the trial court and modified by the appellate court is reduced to the period already undergone by him, which would be sufficient and justifiable to serve interest of justice. The accused-petitioner is on bail. He need not to surrender. His bail bonds are discharged.

13. The revision petition stands disposed of accordingly.

14. A copy of this order along with records be sent to the trial court forthwith.

(BHUWAN GOYAL),J

51/DK