

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

CRR No.841 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 28, 2015.

Sushila Devi

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR.

Present: Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Arnav Sood, Advocate for respondent No.2-complainant.

SNEH PRASHAR, J.

In criminal complaint bearing CIS No.119 of 2013 filed by respondent No.2 Surinder Singh against petitioner Sushila Devi, the petitioner was convicted under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act vide judgment dated 18.09.2014 and was sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of six months vide order even dated.

The petitioner preferred an appeal against the judgment of

conviction and order of sentence but the same was dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur vide judgment dated 12.02.2015. Subsequent to the same, present criminal revision petition was preferred to this court and vide order dated 01.04.2015 the sentence of the petitioner was suspended.

After respondent No.2-complainant appeared on notice of the petition, the parties arrived at a compromise. A written instrument of compromise dated 23.03.2015 duly signed by both the parties was filed. Considering the factum of compromise, the parties were directed to appear before learned trial Court/Area Magistrate for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise arrived at between them. In compliance of the order, they appeared before learned trial court on 21.04.2015. Statement of respondent No.2-complainant Surinder Singh son of Hukam Singh was recorded wherein he stated that he has compromised the matter in dispute with petitioner Smt. Sushila Devi with the intervention of respectables without any threat, coercion or undue influence. Statement of the petitioner was also recorded and she too stated that the compromise was without any threat or coercion from any quarter.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant submitted that the claim of the respondent with regard to the instant petition has been satisfied and now there remains nothing due between him and the petitioner.

The parties have arrived at a legal compromise. They are residents of nearby villages located in Tehsil Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur. The compromise is in their benefit and will help them lead a

happy and harmonious life. Accordingly, the compromise between the parties is accepted and the offence is allowed to be compounded.

Consequent to the compromise the revision petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and she is acquitted of the charges against her.

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE

July 28, 2015
jitender