



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRA-D-296-DB-2015 (O&M)**  
**Reserved on : 12.03.2026**  
**Pronounced on : 17.04.2026**  
**Judgment uploaded on : 17.04.2026**

*Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced : Full*

Raj Singh ....Appellant

VERSUS

State of Haryana ....Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**

Present : Ms. Harshita Kalra, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Varun Gupta, DAG Haryana.

**ALKA SARIN, J.**

1. The present appeal assails the judgment dated 27.01.2015 and the order of sentence dated 30.01.2015 rendered by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Palwal emanating out of FIR No.28 dated 15.01.2014 registered for offences under Sections 376A and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and Sections 4 and 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (for short 'POCSO Act') at Police Station Hodal. Vide the impugned judgment the appellant was convicted under Sections 376, 376(2)(i)(j)(k)(n) and 506 IPC and Section 4 of the POCSO Act and vide order dated 30.01.2015 he was sentenced to undergo the sentences as follows :

Sr. No.	Section	Sentence
1	376 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹20,000/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 02 months.



2	506 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for three years.
3	4 POCO Act	Rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of ₹20,000/-. In default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 02 months

2. The facts, as culled out in the judgment of the Trial Court, are that the complainant presented an application (Ex.PA) to the SHO Police Station Hodal on 15.01.2014 regarding lodging of FIR against her husband (appellant herein) for committing sexual assault and rape upon the prosecutrix, who is daughter of the complainant. In the complaint (Ex.PA), the complainant alleged that she was married to the appellant on 07.03.2000 and three children were born out of wedlock, two daughters and one son. The eldest daughter is the prosecutrix, who was born in village Dhatir on 21.11.2002. The prosecutrix was stated to be studying in 5<sup>th</sup> Class. On 06.01.2014, when the complainant and her entire family members were present in the house situated at Hodal, the appellant after having beaten her confined her in a room and thereafter took the prosecutrix to the store of the house and beat her and committed rape upon her. Thereafter, he opened the door and went out of the house. On the next day on being repeatedly asked by the complainant, the prosecutrix disclosed that her father (appellant herein) had committed sexual assault on her and the prosecutrix was also criminally intimidated by the appellant not to disclose about the aforesaid sexual assault to anyone. The complainant further alleged that the prosecutrix was frightened after the incident. On the insistence and repeated requests of the complainant, the prosecutrix disclosed the aforesaid facts in detail that her father (appellant herein) had been committing sexual assault on her. The complainant stated that her husband (appellant herein) had been absconding since 07.01.2014 after having left his house. Before leaving the house, the appellant threatened



the complainant and the three children with dire consequences. The complainant alongwith the prosecutrix came to report the matter in the Police Station against the appellant. On the basis of the complaint, FIR No.28 dated 15.01.2014 under Sections 376A and 506 IPC and 4 of the POCSO Act was registered at Police Station Hodal. The prosecutrix was medically examined and thereafter her statement was recorded under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as 'CrPC') before the learned Magistrate. Statements of the witnesses were also recorded. The appellant was medico-legally examined. After completion of investigation, challan was presented under Section 173 CrPC. On 06.03.2014 the charges for commission of offences under Sections 376, 376(2)(i)(j)(k)(n) and 506 IPC and 4 and 6 of the POCSO Act were framed against the appellant to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

3. The prosecution examined 10 witnesses. The statement of the appellant was recorded under Section 313 CrPC. The appellant in his statement under Section 313 CrPC while denying the case of the prosecution stated that a false case had been registered against him and that the witnesses had deposed falsely. It was further stated by him that the complainant had illicit physical relations with Subedar Major Harpal Singh and he objected to this relation and due to said reason the complianant used to have altercations and, therefore, his daughter made a false report against him at the instance of his wife. Though the appellant stated in his statement that he would like to lead evidence, however, no evidence was led by him and vide a statement made by him on 21.01.2015, he closed his evidence.

4. Vide judgment dated 27.01.2015 the appellant was convicted



under Sections 376, 376(2)(i)(j)(k)(n) and 506 IPC and 4 of the POCSO Act and vide order dated 30.01.2015 he was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment as stated above.

5. The judgment passed by the Trial Court has been assailed by the appellant that no cogent evidence was led to connect the appellant with the offence. Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that there is no corroborative medical evidence to support the statement of the prosecutrix. There were no injuries which were found on medico-legal examination of the prosecutrix and no semen was detected. Learned counsel for the appellant has further contended that there is no explanation for the delay in lodging the FIR. The occurrence is stated to have taken place on 06.01.2014 and the medical of the prosecutrix was conducted on 15.01.2014. It is further the contention of learned counsel for the appellant that a false case has been planted at the instance of the mother of the prosecutrix as she had illicit relations with one Subedar Major Harpal Singh and that the said Subedar Major Harpal Singh had travelled with them in the same train upto Delhi and thereafter had left them at the residence in Hodal.

6. Learned State counsel would contend that an accused can be convicted solely on the basis of the testimony of the prosecutrix as per the settled law. Learned State counsel has further contended that the prosecutrix stood by the version recorded in her statement under Section 164 CrPC. It is further the contention that a minor child due to fear, since perpetrator was none other than the father, did not disclose the earlier events to her mother. Learned State counsel has further contended that the medical evidence supports the case of the prosecution. It has further been contended that the



delay in lodging the FIR stands explained by the complainant and has been dealt with in extenso by the Trial Court.

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance have perused the record. It is to be noticed that no argument has been addressed by learned counsel for the appellant qua the age of the prosecutrix.

8. In the present case, the Trial Court discussed the statements of the witnesses as under :

**“Prosecutrix (PW2)**

7. She deposed the incident of 6.1.2014 starting time 10 a.m. when her father took her to the market, purchased bracelet and asked her to commit sexual intercourse with him once in a month, as such that he would permit him to do so, then he would leave his drinking habit and will stop beating her mother. They returned home and she disclosed this incident to her mother and, in turn, the mother disclosed these facts to her maternal uncle who then visited their house. When maternal uncle asked her, she narrated these facts to him also. In the night after taking liquor her father gave severe beatings to her mother and removed her clothes. Thereafter, he removed his clothes also in front of her mother and confined her in a room and subsequently committed rape upon her by taking her separately in a store room and by hitting her on her head because of which she became unconscious. She was medicolegally examined by the police and her clothes were handed over to the doctor vide memo Ex.PB. Her statement Ex.PC was recorded in the court before Illaqa



*Magistrate. Subsequently her custody was handed over to her maternal uncle vide memo Ex.PD.*

**Pushpa (PW1)**

8. *She is mother of the prosecutrix. As per her deposition, her marriage was solemnized with accused Raj Singh on 7.3.2000. They have three children when daughter (prosecutrix) was born on 21.11.2002. Her husband namely accused Raj Singh came on leave on 5.1.2014. The next day he took her daughter who was playing outside the house to the market. In the night he gave beatings to her and confined her in a room and then committed upon the prosecutrix and thereafter, threatened her with dire consequences and fled away from the house. She moved application Ex.PA regarding the said episode to the police station on 15.1.2014. Her daughter was medicolegally examined at General Hospital, Hodal and doctor handed over a sealed parcel containing clothes of her daughter with sample seal to the police vide memo Ex.PB, a document attested by her. The statement of her daughter under section 164 Cr.P.C was recorded on 17.1.2014.*

**Police Witnesses**

**ASI Prithvi Singh (PW9)**

9. *He first received the application Ex.PA from complainant Pushpa on 15.1.2014 with the endorsement Ex.PH on the basis of which formal FIR Ex.P1 was recorded. He sent the prosecutrix along with LHC Suman to CHC Hodal for medicolegal examination. The MLR, pullandas along with two bottles of swab and envelope containing samples were handed over to him by lady constable Suman which he took into possession vide memo*



*Ex.PJ. He then visited the spot, enquired to the people and prepared the site plan Ex.PK and recorded statements of witnesses. After that SI Ashwani Kumar and DSP Rajbir Singh came on the spot. Accused Raj Singh was arrested. Case property was deposited on same day with MHC. On 16.1.2014 he along with HC Vijay Singh got the medicolegal examination of accused conducted from CHC Hodal and pullanda containing clothes of accused and other relevant documents with sample seals were handed over to him by HC Vijay Singh by Ex.PL. Accused was produced in the court and case property was deposited with MHC on same day. On 31.1.2014 the scaled site plan of the place of occurrence was got prepared through Sarwan Kumar. He recorded the statements of official witnesses. Earlier to that, statement of prosecutrix was recorded in the court on 18.1.2014. The case property namely underwear of accused Raj Singh Ex.PO, two bottles of swabs Ex.PP and one bottle of swab Ex.PQ and underwear of prosecutrix Ex.PR were identified by him. Lastly, after completion of investigation, challan was presented in the court.*

**Lady HC Suman (PW10)**

*10. She accompanied the prosecutrix on 15.1.2014 for conducting the medicolegal examination from CHC Hodal. Case property was taken into custody by Ex.PJ by IO Prithvi Singh, a document signed by her.*

**Khem Chand (PW11)**

*11. He proved the birth certificate Ex.P2 from the office of Birth Registration maintained by Civil Surgeon Faridabad now*



*situated at Palwal. As per the record, date of birth of prosecutrix is recorded as 21.11.2002 in the records.*

**ASI Sarwan Kumar (PW3)**

*12. He proved the site plan Ex.PF prepared by him on the demarcation of ASI Prithvi Raj on 31.1.2014.*

**HC Ajit Singh (PW4)**

*13. He is a formal witness who forwarded the special report to the Illaqa Magistrate and higher police officials.*

**EASI Rohtash (PW7)**

*14. He tendered his duly sworn affidavit Ex.PW7/A deposing that he deposited the case property with FSL Madhuban on 28.1.2014 and did not tamper with the same so long it remained in his custody.*

**HC Subhash Chand (PW8)**

*15. He tendered his duly sworn affidavit Ex.PW8/A deposing that ASI Prithvi Raj had deposited the case property with him when he was posted as Malkhana Mohrar in the Police Station in the present case. He handed over the same to EASI Rohtash for depositing the same with FSL Madhuban, who, on his return, handed over the receipt to this witness after depositing with FSL Madhuban. He did not tamper with the same so long it remained in his custody.*

**Medical Evidence**

**Dr. Santosh (PW6)**

*16. She tendered her duly sworn affidavit Ex.PW6/A and had conducted the MLR of prosecutrix by Ex.PW6/B.*



**Dr. H.C. Pankaj (PW5)**

17. He tendered his duly sworn affidavit ExPW5/A, who conducted the MLR of accused Raj Singh by Ex.PG.

9. The argument of learned counsel for the appellant that there was no corroboration of the statement of the prosecutrix cannot be accepted. It is trite that an accused can be convicted solely on the basis of testimony of the prosecutrix. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Punjab vs. Gurmit Singh [1996 (1) RCR (Criminal) 533]** in paras 8 and 21 has held as under:

*“8....The courts must, while evaluating evidence, remain alive to the fact that in a case of rape, no self-respecting woman would come forward in a court just to make a humiliating statement against her honour such as is involved in the commission of rape on her. In cases involving sexual molestation, supposed considerations which have no material effect on the veracity of the prosecution case or even discrepancies in the statement of the prosecutrix should not, unless the discrepancies are such which are of fatal nature, be allowed to throw out an otherwise reliable prosecution case. The inherent bashfulness of the females and the tendency to conceal outrage of sexual aggression are factors which the Courts should not overlook. The testimony of the victim in such cases is vital and unless there are compelling reasons which necessitate looking for corroboration of her statement, the courts should find no difficulty to act on the*



*testimony of a victim of sexual assault alone to convict an accused where her testimony inspires confidence and is found to be reliable. Seeking corroboration of her statement before relying upon the same, as a rule, in such cases amounts to adding insult to injury. Why should the evidence of a girl of a woman who complains of rape or sexual molestation, be viewed with doubt, disbelief or suspicion? The Court while appreciating the evidence of a prosecutrix may look for some assurance of her statement to satisfy its judicial conscience, since she is a witness who is interested in the outcome of the charge levelled by her, but there is no requirement of law to insist upon corroboration of her statement to base conviction of an accused. The evidence of a victim of sexual assault stands almost at par with the evidence of an injured witness and to an extent is even more reliable. Just as a witness who has sustained some injury in the occurrence, which is not found to be self inflicted, is considered to be a good witness in the sense that he is least likely to shield the real culprit, the evidence of a victim of a sexual offence is entitled to great weight, absence of corroboration notwithstanding. Corroborative evidence is not an imperative component of judicial credence in every case of rape. Corroboration as a condition for judicial reliance on the testimony of the prosecutrix is not a requirement of law but a guidance of prudence under given circumstances. It must not be over-looked that a woman or*



*a girl subjected to sexual assault is not an accomplice to the crime but is a victim of another persons's lust and it is improper and undesirable to test her evidence with a certain amount of suspicion, treating her as if she were an accomplice. Inferences have to be drawn from a given set of facts and circumstances with realistic diversity and not dead uniformity lest that type of rigidity in the shape of rule of law is introduced through a new form of testimonial tyranny making justice a casualty. Courts cannot cling to a fossil formula and insist upon corroboration even if, taken as a whole, the case spoken of by the victim of sex crime strikes the judicial mind as probable....”*

*“21. Of late, crime against women in general and rape in particular is on the increase. It is an irony that while we are celebrating women's rights in all spheres, we show little or no concern for her honour. It is a sad reflection on the attitude of indifference of the society towards the violation of human dignity of the victims of sex crimes. We must remember that a rapist not only violates the victim's privacy and personal integrity, but inevitably causes serious psychological as well as physical harm in the process. Rape is not merely a physical assault - it is often destructive of the whole personality of the victim. A murderer destroys the physical body of his victim, a rapist degrades the very soul of the helpless female. The Courts, therefore, shoulder a great responsibility while trying an accused on charges of rape. They must deal with such*



*cases with utmost sensitivity. The Courts should examine the broader probabilities of a case and not get swayed by minor contradictions or insignificant discrepancies in the statement of the prosecutrix, which are not of a fatal nature, to throw out an otherwise reliable prosecution case. If evidence of the prosecutrix inspires confidence, it must be relied upon without seeking corroboration of her statement in material particulars. If for some reason the Court finds it difficult to place implicit reliance on her testimony, it may look for evidence which may lend assurance to her testimony, short of corroboration required in the case of an accomplice. The testimony of the prosecutrix must be appreciated in the background of the entire case and the trial court must be alive to its responsibility and be sensitive while dealing with cases involving sexual molestations.”*

10. Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Deepak Kumar Sahu vs. State of Chhattisgarh [AIR 2025 SC 3763]** has held as under :

*“5.6.5 As early as in State of Maharashtra vs. Chandraprakash Kewalchand Jain, [(1990) 1 SCC 550], this court observed that the prosecutrix of a sex offence cannot be put on a par with the accomplice, it was further observed that she is a victim of crime. The Evidence Act nowhere says that her evidence cannot be accepted unless it is corroborated in material particulars. It was further observed that evidence of a rape victim must receive the same weight as is attached to an injured in cases of*



*physical violence. It was stated that there is no rule of law or practice incorporated in the Evidence Act similar to illustration (b) to Section 114 of the Evidence Act which may require it to look for corroboration.*

*5.7 The last submission on behalf of the appellant that there were discrepancies in the evidences of victim (PW-2) and her brother (PW-11) has no room to stand, for, no material discrepancy could be noticed by the Court on comparison of the evidence of the two witnesses. Even otherwise, discrepancies in evidence which are of minor nature not going to the root have to be ignored. This Court observed in Lok Mal alias Loku (supra) that in criminal jurisprudence the principle is that the evidence of prosecutrix in case of rape is of the same value as that of an injured witness and conviction can be made on the basis of the sole testimony of the prosecutrix, while reiterating this.”*

11. In a similar case of **State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Asha Ram [AIR 2006 SC 381]** where a father had raped his minor daughter aged 12/15 years, the Supreme Court had upheld the conviction and enhanced the sentence to life imprisonment. Their Lordships held as under :

*“14. It is contended by the counsel for the accused that because of the strained relationship between PW3-mother of the prosecutrix and the accused, the prosecution case has been foisted against the accused at the instigation of the mother and deserves outright rejection. From the*



*evidence it is clearly established that P.Ws. 1 and 2 despite of strained relationship between their mother and father were happily staying with the accused and there is no rhyme or reason as to why the daughter should depose falsely so as to expose her honour and dignity and also expose the whole family to the society risking the outcasting or ostracization and condemnation by the family circle as well as by the society. No girl of self respect and dignity who is conscious of her chastity having expectations of married life and livelihood would accuse falsely against any other person of rape, much less against her father, sacrificing thereby her chastity and also expose the entire family to shame and at the risk of condemnation and ostracization by the society. It is unthinkable to suggest that the mother would go to the extent of inventing a story of sexual assault of her own daughter and tutor her to narrate a story of sexual assault against a person who is no other than her husband and father of the girl, at the risk of bringing down their social status and spoil their reputation in the society as well as family circle to which they belong to”.*

12. It is to be seen whether statement made by the prosecutrix was of sterling quality. Ex.PC is a detailed statement of the prosecutrix recorded under Section 164 CrPC narrating incidents spanning over a long period. A perusal of the said statement reveals that the prosecutrix had unhesitatingly narrated the incidents covering very minor detail. It is a detailed statement



with narration of numerous instances. Possibly, as also held by the Trial Court, the prosecutrix did not understand the nature of what was happening to her, but it is apparent that there was sexual assault committed upon her. In the statement (Ex.PC) the prosecutrix (PW-2) had given the same details of the incident of 06.01.2014 as now stated in her deposition. There is no contradiction or discrepancy qua the incident of 06.01.2014 as stated by her in her statement (Ex.PC) and in her deposition before the Court. This Court does not find any reason to doubt the testimonies of PW-2 the prosecutrix and her mother PW1 the complainant, which are totally reliable and trustworthy.

13. There is no discrepancy in the statements of the prosecutrix PW-2 and the mother of the prosecutrix PW-1, who both have spoken consistently about the incident of 06.01.2014. Both the prosecutrix PW-2 and PW-1 (mother of the prosecutrix) stated that at night the appellant gave a beating to Pushpa and thereafter took the prosecutrix to a storeroom and committed rape upon her.

14. The argument of learned counsel for the appellant that the medical evidence does not corroborate the prosecution version can also not be accepted. The incident is dated 06.01.2014 and the prosecutrix was medico-legally examined on 15.01.2014 and therefore her MLR (Ex.PW6/B) and FSL Report (Ex.PE) would not be of much importance. Dr. Santosh was examined as PW6, who stated that through there was no external injury, however, the hymen was found ruptured. There was no evidence brought on the record by the appellant to show that the prosecutrix used to do heavy cycling, playing, jumping or horse riding etc. Therefore, the medical evidence also corroborated the case as set up by the prosecution.



15. It was observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Ranjit Hazarika vs. State of Assam [(1998) 8 SCC 635]** that absence of injuries on the victim's private parts or non-rupture of hymen does not belie the testimony of the prosecutrix. In the recent judgment of **Lok Mal @ Loku vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh [AIR 2025 SC 1437]** the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that merely because of medical evidence where there are no major injuries reported cannot be a reason to discard the otherwise reliable evidence of the prosecutrix. It was further held that injury on private parts is not necessary in each and every case and it depends on the facts and circumstances of a particular case. Hence, the absence of injuries on the victim is not always fatal to the case of the prosecution in such matters.

16. The argument of learned counsel for the appellant qua the delay in lodging the FIR also cannot be accepted in view of the fact that PW-1, the complainant, has explained the reasons for delay in lodging the FIR. She stated that she had received injuries which were inflicted by the appellant and on 07.01.2014 she had accompanied her brother to her parental house and on 09.01.2014 she had gone to the office of DSP, Palwal and moved an application which was forwarded to a lady constable. Said lady constable went on leave for 2-3 days. Thereafter, on 11.01.2014 she met the same lady constable who advised her to file a proper complaint before the Police Station Hodal. Thereafter, the application (Ex.PA) was filed. Supreme Court in the case of **Satpal Singh vs. State of Haryana [2010 (3) RCR (Criminal) 777]** where the FIR was lodged after about 04 months of commission of offence, held as under :



*“15. However, no straight jacket formula can be laid down in this regard. In case of sexual offences, the criteria may be different altogether. As honour of the family is involved, its members have to decide whether to take the matter to the court or not. In such a fact-situation, near relations of the prosecutrix may take time as to what course of action should be adopted. Thus, delay is bound to occur. This Court has always taken judicial notice of the fact that "ordinarily the family of the victim would not intend to get a stigma attached to the victim. Delay in lodging the First Information Report in a case of this nature is a normal phenomenon" [vide Satyapal Vs. State of Haryana 2007 (2) RCR (Criminal 695)].*

*16. In State of Himachal Pradesh Vs. Prem Singh 2009 (5) RCR (Criminal) 720, this Court considered the issue at length and observed as under :*

*"So far as the delay in lodging the FIR is concerned, the delay in a case of sexual assault, cannot be equated with the case involving other offences. There are several factors which weigh in the mind of the prosecutrix and her family members before coming to the police station to lodge a complaint. In a tradition bound society prevalent in India, more particularly, rural areas, it would be quite unsafe to throw out the prosecution case merely on the ground that there is some delay in lodging the FIR."*



17. Thus, in view of the above, the delay in lodging FIR in sexual offences has to be considered with a different yardstick.

18. If the instant case is examined in the light of the aforesaid settled legal proposition, we are of the considered opinion that the delay in lodging the FIR has been satisfactorily explained.”

17. In the case of **State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Shree Kant Shekari [AIR 2004 SC 4404]** it was held that delay in registration of FIR in the presence of cogent circumstances is not a mitigating factor for the case when the accusation of rape is involved. Their Lordships have held as under :

“19. The unusual circumstances satisfactorily explained the delay in lodging of the first information report. In any event, delay per se is not a mitigating circumstance for the accused when accusations of rape are involved. Delay in lodging first information report cannot be used as a ritualistic formula for discarding prosecution case and doubting its authenticity. It only puts the court on guard to search for and consider if any explanation has been offered for the delay. Once it is offered, the Court is to only see whether it is satisfactory or not. In a case if the prosecution fails to satisfactory explain the delay and there is possibility of embellishment or exaggeration in the prosecution version on account of such delay, it is a relevant factor. On the other hand satisfactory explanation of the delay is weighty enough to reject the



*plea of false implication or vulnerability of prosecution case. As the factual scenario shows, the victim was totally unaware of the catastrophe which had befallen to her. That being so, the mere delay in lodging of first information report does not in any way render prosecution version brittle. These aspects were highlighted in Tulshidas Kanolkar v. State of Goa [2003 (4) RCR (Criminal) 964; 2003 (8) SCC 590].”*

Here too there is cogent explanation forthcoming for the delay in lodging the FIR.

18. The argument of learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has falsely been implicated in the present case due to the fact that the mother of the prosecutrix was having illicit relations with Subedar Major Harpal Singh has not been proved on the record. The appellant, as noticed above, did not lead any evidence and simply stated in his statement recorded under Section 313 CrPC that his wife had illicit relations with Subedar Major Harpal Singh. No evidence has been brought on record to substantiate the said averment. The defence of the appellant that a false case has been planted upon him is completely untenable inasmuch as no evidence has been brought on record to show any illicit relationship between PW1 (complainant) and the said Subedar Major Harpal Singh. The defence also failed to bring any evidence on the record to prove as to why a daughter would falsely implicate her own father.

19. In view of the foregoing, we find ourselves in agreement with the findings recorded by the Trial Court, which in our considered view do not warrant any interference or modification. The judgment dated 27.01.2015 and



order of sentence dated 30.01.2015 are upheld and the present appeal is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

20. Since the appellant is undergoing the sentence, let a copy of this judgment be supplied to him free of costs through the Superintendent of the Jail concerned.

**( ALKA SARIN )  
JUDGE**

**( RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI )  
JUDGE**

17.04.2026  
jk

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking  
Whether reportable: YES/NO