

217

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

CRR No.3074 of 2015

Date of decision: December 4, 2015

Ramdia Bhardwaj

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. U.K. Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima, AAG Haryana.

Respondent No2-Complainant in person along with
Mr. Vivek Goel, Advocate.

SABINA, J

Petitioner had faced trial in FIR No.147 dated 30.05.2013, under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), registered at Police Station City Jind.

Trial Court vide judgment/order dated 30.05.2013 ordered the conviction and sentence of the petitioner qua commission of offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC. In an appeal preferred by the petitioner, he was acquitted for the offence punishable under Section 420 IPC by the Appellate Court vide order dated 22.07.2015, whereas, conviction and sentence of the petitioner under Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC, were upheld. Hence, the present petition by the petitioner.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for

the petitioner has not challenged the conviction of the petitioner under Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC, but has submitted that the sentence qua imprisonment of the petitioner be reduced to the period already undergone by him as the parties have amicably settled their dispute.

Respondent No.2-Complainant is present in person along with his counsel and has admitted the factum of compromise effected between the parties and has stated that he has no objection, if the sentence qua imprisonment of the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him. Respondent No.2-Complainant has further submitted that the decision of the present case shall not have any bearing on the appeal pending before the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi.

Accordingly, conviction of the petitioner under Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC is maintained. However, sentence qua imprisonment of the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him. Petitioner, who is in custody be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. The decision of this case will have no bearing on the appeal pending before the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

December 04, 2015
mahavir