



2026:DHC:3214



* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of decision: 17th April, 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

+ CRL.A. 627/2011 & CRL.M.A. 38758/2025

SALIG RAM

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Amit Chadha, Sr. Adv with Mr. Tarun Khanna, Mr. Harjas Singh Chhatwal, Mr. Chander Vijay Sharma, Mr. Ammar Mustafa & Ms. Annu Gupta, Advs.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV

JUDGMENT (ORAL)

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J.

1. At the outset learned Senior Counsel for the Appellant submitted that he does not want to assail the conviction and confines his arguments on the aspect of sentence only and prays that given the fact that the Appellant has crossed 70 years of age, faced the agony of a criminal trial / proceeding for about 21 years and despite the fact that he has been exonerated in the Departmental Proceedings but he would not be entitled to claim medical and pensionary benefits on account of this conviction standing against it, he may therefore, be considered for the lightest possible punishment and preferably the period already undergone in custody by him may be taken into



2026:DHC:3214



consideration as the punishment. Learned Senior Counsel for the Appellant has placed reliance on the following judgments in this context:

- i) ***M/s A.K. Sarkar & CO. & Anr. vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.*** in SLP (Criminal) No. 6095 of 2018; and
- ii) ***STATE (G.N.C.T.) OF DELHI vs Mohit Kumar & Anr.*** in CrI.A No. 541/2009.

2. Learned APP, on the other hand, submitted that the offence involves financial angle, therefore, this aspect may be kept in consideration while considering the aspect of sentence apart from the fact that corruption should not be taken lightly.

3. The Appellant was convicted under Section 7 and 13(1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 ('POCA') as he was found guilty of demanding and accepting bribe of Rs. 1,500/-, out of which Rs. 1,000/- was received by him, which was recovered by the Raiding Party. The other formalities confirmed the complicity which ultimately resulted into his conviction.

4. In these circumstances, in order to make the Appellant realize his folly, it seems appropriate that the financial aspect of the sentence may be enhanced. Therefore taking into account the entire gamut of facts and circumstances, the appeal so far as the Judgment dated 31.03.2011 is concerned, the same is upheld and appeal stands declined to that extent.

5. Having considered the submissions made by the contesting sides, the judgment relied and the fact that the Appellant has turned 71 years of age, undergone the turmoil of a criminal trial for more than two decades, a substantial part of an individual's life, suffering from various age related ailments, therefore, when the prosecution too has sort of no reservation qua the proposition floated by the learned Senior Advocate, and that the



2026:DHC:3214



custodial sentence would likely to be a burden on State Exchequer, so it needs to be given indulgence.

6. So far as the aspect of sentence is concerned, it stands modified as the period already undergone by him during the trial is taken into account as substantial punishment, whereas the fine of Rs. 5,000/- imposed upon him stands enhanced to Rs. 50,000/- and in case the Appellant has already deposited the sum of Rs. 5,000/-, the same shall be deducted from the fine awarded now, otherwise the whole amount shall be deposited with the Trial Court within a week from today.

7. Appeal stands disposed of accordingly. Pending application(s) also stands disposed of.

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J

APRIL 17, 2026/hk