

CRR-1683-2026 (O&M)

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-1683-2026 (O&M)

MANPREET SINGH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	
1.	The day when the judgment is reserved	20.08.2026
2.	The day when the judgment is pronounced	31.08.2026
3.	The day when the judgment is uploaded on website	31.08.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Parminder Walia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akash Yadav, AAG Punjab.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J. (Oral)

1. Revisionist Manpreet Singh faced trial in case vide FIR No.34 dated 23.02.2018 under Sections 279, 337, 338 and 427 Indian Penal Code, Police Station City, Hoshiarpur. He was convicted under Sections 279, 337 and 338 IPC by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Hoshiarpur vide judgment and order on quantum of sentence dated 21.07.2022. He was sentenced us under:

Name of convict	Convicted under Sections	Sentence
Manpreet Singh	279 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 03 months



	Section 337 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 03 months
	Section 338 IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for a period of 06 months

2. In appeal, the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur maintained conviction and sentence of the revisionist under Sections 279, 337 and 338 IPC.
3. Dissatisfied with the judgment in appeal, revisionist is before this Court.
4. At the very outset, learned counsel for the revisionist submits that out of substantive sentence of 06 months, revisionist has already undergone custody of 04 months 08 days and prays that substantive sentence awarded by the trial Court be reduced to the period already undergone.
5. Learned State counsel submits that the sentence awarded by learned trial Magistrate is appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the case and there is no warrant for its further reduction or alteration. He prays that sentence of the revisionist be maintained.
6. Facts of the case, as per FIR, are that revisionist/accused was working as driver on school bus of Little Flower Model School, Hoshiarpur. On 23.02.2018 at about 4:00 PM, the said bus overturned near Rest House, Hoshiarpur. One Ravi Kumar Verma stated to the police that he was working as driver of e-rickshaw belonging to Chaudhary Balbir Singh Public School near Arya Samaj Mandir, Hoshiarpur. After dropping school children, he was waiting for some other passengers near Indoor Stadium, Hoshiarpur, when bus of Little Flower School, Hoshiarpur came from the side of Church at a very



fast speed, being driven recklessly. Driver of the bus did not apply brakes and turned the bus towards Rest House. The bus went out of his control and overturned. School children and staff members travelling in the said bus received multiple injuries. Registration number of the said bus was PB-07-AL-6954 and the same was being driven by Manpreet Singh son of Tarsem Singh of village Chaggran. Name of the conductor was Pawan Kumar son of Om Parkash, resident of Aslamabad. The passersby shifted the injured to Civil Hospital, Hoshiarpur in ambulance and other vehicles. On the statement, police registered case under Sections 279, 337, 338, 427 of IPC, at Police Station City, Hoshiarpur against the accused. During investigation, Investigating Officer visited the spot and prepared rough site plan of the spot of occurrence. He arranged photographs of the spot, took the bus in possession and recorded statements of witnesses under Section 161 Cr.PC. He arrested the accused and released him on bail. On completion of investigation, police presented the final report.

7. Copies of challan were supplied to the accused free of cost under Section 207 Cr.P.C and copies of report dated 173 Cr.P.C.

8. *Prima facie* case under Sections 279, 337, 338, 427 Indian Penal Code being made out against the accused, he was charge-sheeted thereunder. He pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

9. Prosecution examined PW1-Ravi Kumar, PW2-Sania, PW3-Manjit Kaur, PW4-Pawan Kumar, PW5-HC Jujhar Singh, PW6-Chand Verma, PW7-ASI Pritpal Singh, PW8-Suneha Singh, PW9-Ravi Dutt, PW10-Dr. Upkar Singh Sooch, PW11-Dr. Rachhpal Singh Bharaj, PW12-Dr. Raman Attri, PW13-Parminder Singh, PW-ASI Jasvir Singh, PW15-ASI Balkar Singh,



PW15 (renumbered)-ASI Amar Nath, whereafter prosecution evidence was closed.

10. In his statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C., accused denied the incriminating evidence against him and pleaded false implication.

11. No witness was examined in defence.

12. Learned JMIC, Hoshiarpur considered the evidence led, the arguments addressed and held that prosecution successfully proved its case. Petitioner Manpreet Singh was convicted under Sections 279, 337, 338 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced as indicated in the preceding paragraph of the judgment. The judgment was affirmed in appeal.

13. On appraisal of the material before learned trial Court and the witnesses recorded during the trial, this Court finds no anomaly, error or perversity in appreciation of evidence by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Hoshiarpur and by learned Appellate Court. Complainant in the case is one Ravi Kumar Verma, driver of an E-rickshaw stationed at a particular spot, when he saw the accused driving the school bus in rash and negligent manner, losing control, resulting in the bus turning turtle and injuring the occupants therein. He identified the accused as the bus driver. PW-2 Sania, who was a student of Class 10, in Little Flower School, not only identified the driver of the bus in which she commuted to school every day, she succinctly narrated the details of the accident and the manner in which Manpreet Singh was driving the bus, at high speed, took sudden turn in rash and negligent manner, thus overturning the bus. Her right arm was fractured as a result of the accident. PW-3 Manjit Kaur was a teacher of Little Flowers School, who also travelled in the bus to school every day, along with other staff members and students.



She too supported and corroborated the version of PW-1 and PW-2 regarding the accused driving the bus at high speed, rashly and negligently. This witness suffered injuries on her left shoulder and leg. Not only the school children and teacher, even the Bus Conductor, PW-4-Pawan Kumar inculpated the accused. In the accident, he suffered fracture on his left leg and injuries on left arm. Version of PW-6 Chand Verma, another teacher in the school is identical. He too attributed rashness and negligence to the accused and identified him. On same lines is the statement of PW-8 Suneha Singh, a student and daily passenger in the school bus. PW-10 Dr. Upkar Singh Sooch, PW-11 Dr. Rachhpal Singh Bharaj and PW-12 Dr. Raman Attri have proved the injuries, simple and grievous, suffered by the occupants of the bus, who they examined.

14. Plea of the accused that there was a mechanical defect in the bus was rightly negated in the wake of testimony of PW-15 (renumbered) ASI Amar Nath, who mechanically examined the vehicle and proved his report Ex. PW-15/A showing that at the time of the occurrence, the bus was in good working condition. The Investigating Officer proved the various stages of investigation.

15. The findings of learned JMIC, Hoshiarpur that petitioner while driving the school bus at high speed, within city limits, particularly when approaching a sharp turn, was rash and negligent cannot be faulted. The fact that the bus carrying numerous school children and teachers, turned turtle, by itself reflects rashness, recklessness, negligence and lack of proper care and caution on part of the accused/petitioner. Learned Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur upon appreciation of evidence led rightly affirmed the judgment of conviction,



order of sentence and refused to interfere in the same. The sentence awarded was found commensurate to the gravity of offence committed.

16. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that accident took place in the year 2016. At that time of commission of offence, petitioner was only 25 years of age and he was now 33 years old. Petitioner had no criminal antecedents. Petitioner had already undergone total sentence of 04 months and 08 days out of substantive sentence of 06 months awarded to him. He being the only bread winner of the family, the order of sentence be modified to the period already undergone.

17. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for reduction in quantum of sentence considering the manner in which the offence was committed and the injuries suffered.

18. Award of sentence is not a mere formality in criminal cases. Sentencing of an accused is complex yet crucial as it serves a social purpose. It serves as deterrent not only for the accused but also for the society at large. Although, much discretion has been vested in the Court, the discretion has to be exercised judiciously, considering the manner in which the offence is committed, the age and other circumstances of the accused, the gravity of offence and the resultant harm caused to the victims. Adequate punishment is important to prevent miscarriage of justice and to maintain public confidence in Criminal Justice system. Petitioner herein was not an ordinary driver of a vehicle, who caused an accident and resultant injuries. He was a professional driver employed by a School to carry young children and teachers from home to school and back. Being entrusted with the transportation of minor school going children, he was under a higher duty to drive the vehicle safely and



CRR-1683-2026 (O&M)

7

responsibly, to maintain safe and reasonable speed, keep proper look out for turns, maintain proper control of the vehicle, while observing all applicable traffic rules and safety regulations. He was required to exercise special care and caution to ensure that the children safely reached home. Any rash, negligent, dangerous driving by driver of a school bus constitutes a serious breach of duty besides the offences under Sections 279, 337 and 338 IPC. On account of the culpable act of the petitioner, several persons including school children suffered grievous injuries. The punishment awarded by learned trial Court, affirmed in appeal is already on the lower side and further reduction in the sentence is not called for. A lenient view has been taken by the trial Court and no further leniency is warranted. Reduction in sentence in cases like the present one, would not be conducive to the interest of the society at large.

19. The revision petition stands dismissed. The conviction and sentence of the petitioner under Sections 279, 337, 338 IPC by learned trial Court, affirmed in appeal is maintained. Prayer for reduction in sentence is refused.

20. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

31.08.2026
Ajay Goswami

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No