



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>CRLR/605/2026</u> Rosy Anand --Revisionist Versus State Of Uttarakhand and Another --Respondents <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Rajat Mittal, learned counsel for the revisionist. Ms. Pushpa Bhatt, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Mr. Prabhat Kandpal, learned A.G.A. assisted by Mr. Nikhil Bisht, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. Ms. Priya Mewari, learned counsel for respondent no. 2. 2. The present Criminal Revision has been preferred against the judgment and order dated 04.06.2026, passed by the learned IInd Additional Sessions Judge, Rishikesh, District Dehradun in Criminal Appeal No. 33 of 2025, whereby the appeal preferred by the revisionist was dismissed and the judgment and order dated 30.04.2025, passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (J.D.)/Judicial Magistrate, Rishikesh, District Dehradun in Criminal Complaint Case No. 1225 of 2016, was affirmed. By the said judgment, the revisionist was convicted for the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months along with a fine of ₹3,40,000/-, out of which ₹5,000/- was directed to be deposited in the State Treasury and the remaining amount of ₹3,35,000/- was



		directed to be paid to the complainant/respondent no. 2 as compensation. The revisionist was further directed to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of thirty days in default of payment of fine. 3. Learned counsel for the parties submit that, after the judgment was passed in the appeal, the parties have amicably settled their dispute. 4. A joint compounding application, duly signed by the learned counsel for the revisionist as well as the learned counsel for respondent no. 2, has been filed before this Court. In the said application, it has been averred that the dispute had arisen in respect of the cheque in question and that the revisionist has now paid the entire cheque amount to the complainant /respondent no. 2, which fact has been admitted by both the parties. Consequently, they have prayed that the offence, being compoundable in nature, be permitted to be compounded in accordance with law. 5. Today, the revisionist and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court through video conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 6. Both the parties have submitted that the entire cheque amount has been paid to respondent no. 2 and that respondent no. 2 has no grievance against the revisionist. They have further stated that, in view of the amicable settlement arrived at between them, they wish to bring the present proceedings to an end. 7. Having regard to the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties and considering that the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, is compoundable
--	--	---



			this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by allowing the impugned judgments and orders to stand. Accordingly, the present Criminal Revision is allowed. The judgment and order dated 04.06.2026, passed by the learned IInd Additional Sessions Judge, Rishikesh, District Dehradun in Criminal Appeal No. 33 of 2025, as well as the judgment and order dated 30.04.2025, passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (J.D.)/Judicial Magistrate, Rishikesh, District Dehradun in Criminal Complaint Case No. 1225 of 2016, are hereby quashed and set aside. 8. Consequently, the compounding application stands allowed and is, accordingly, disposed of. (Alok Mahra, J.) 07-08-2026 SB
--	--	--	--