

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP(Crl.) No.18454 of 2025)

HALKAI @PYARELAL

APPELLANT

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

RESPONDENT

O R D E R

Heard Ms. Iram Majid, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Sridhar Potaraju, learned Additional Advocate General for the respondent-State of Madhya Pradesh.

2. Leave granted.

3. The present appeal arises out of the impugned judgment dated 05.12.2024 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur in Criminal Appeal No.2493 of 2010 by which, the High Court has upheld the conviction of the appellant as awarded by the IIIrd Additional Sessions Judge, Sagar, Madhya Pradesh *vide* judgment dated 25.10.2010 in Sessions Case No.390 of 2010 under Sections 376-2(f) and 506-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, the "IPC") and also the sentence to undergo life imprisonment under Section 376-2(f) of the IPC along with a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) and in default of payment of fine, rigorous imprisonment of another six months and under Section 506-B of the

IPC and further to undergo rigorous imprisonment of one year along with a fine of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred) and in default of payment of fine, rigorous imprisonment of another one month.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that there are many discrepancies in the testimonies of the witnesses which entitles the appellant to be acquitted at least on the basis of giving him benefit of doubt. However, it was contended that the Court may, for the ends of justice, fix the sentence of the appellant instead of life imprisonment which under normal circumstances, would mean that the appellant has to be in jail till the end of his natural life. Learned counsel for the appellant has also assisted the Court with the facts of the case and the materials on record.

5. Learned Additional Advocate General for the respondent-State of Madhya Pradesh submits that the crime for which the appellant had been convicted is heinous in nature and he will be a threat to the society after coming out of the jail and the Court if inclined, may impose conditions so that he does not repeat the offence.

6. Having considered the matter in its entirety and going through the materials on record, this Court is of the view that the impugned judgment calls for no interference on merits. However, we are of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be served, if the punishment is modified from life imprisonment to that of twenty years of actual incarceration without remission.

7. Accordingly, the conviction of the appellant as awarded by the by the IIIrd Additional Sessions Judge, Sagar, Madhya Pradesh *vide* its judgment dated 25.10.2010 in Sessions Case No.390 of 2010 under Sections 376-2(f) and 506-B of the IPC and upheld by the High Court

vide its impugned judgment dated 05.12.2024 in Criminal Appeal No.2493 of 2010, is modified to that of twenty years of actual incarceration without remission.

8. The appeal stands disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

.....J.
[AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH]

.....J.
[MANMOHAN]

NEW DELHI
SEPTEMBER 03, 2026

ITEM NO.26

COURT NO.9

SECTION II-E

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).18454/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05-12-2024 in CRLA No.2493/2010 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh Principal Seat at Jabalpur]

HALKAI @PYARELAL

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

Date : 03-09-2026 This matter was called for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Iram Majid, Adv.
Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb, AoR
Mr. Mohd. Suboor, Adv.
Mr. Tanveer Zaki, Adv.
Mr. Mohd. Saad Khan, Adv.
Mr. Amaam Siddiqui, Adv.
Mr. Goutham M.S., Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Sridhar Potaraju, A.A.G.
Ms. Mrinal Gopal Elker, AoR
Ms. Niharika Singh, Adv.
Ms. Silpi S Swain, Adv.

O R D E R

Heard Ms. Iram Majid, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Sridhar Potaraju, learned Additional Advocate General for the respondent-State of Madhya Pradesh.

2. Leave granted.

3. The appeal stands disposed of in terms of the signed order.
4. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SAPNA BISHT)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(Signed order is placed on the file)

(ANJALI PANWAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR