

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

**CRR No.1224 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 23, 2016**

Harnek Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.P.S. Gill, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kamaldeep Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Complainant Ved Parkash along with his counsel Mr. Kamaldeep Singh, has appeared. Complainant as well as his counsel state that the parties have entered into a compromise and affirmed the correctness of the compromise dated 03.10.2015 (Annexure P-1). Complainant himself states that he has received the entire money, which was subject matter of the dispute.

It comes out that the present petitioner was convicted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patiala and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and six months and to pay a compensation equivalent to half of the cheque amount, vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 17.04.2015.

The appeal filed by the present petitioner was dismissed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Patiala, vide judgment dated 15.09.2015.

Since, the parties have lawfully compounded the offence, therefore, the present revision is allowed. The judgment passed by both the courts below are set aside and the petitioner stands acquitted of the notice served upon him.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands allowed.

April 23, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE