

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

**CRR No.3870 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: March 16, 2016**

Jasbir Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. H.S. Mann, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gursimran Singh Bawa, 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)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the judgment dated 14.07.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge (A), Gurdaspur, affirming the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 01.03.2013 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Batala, vide which the accused-petitioner was convicted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 420 IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years and to pay a fine of ₹10,000/-, in default thereof to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months.

The allegations levelled against the accused-petitioner are that he had taken some money from the complainant for sending him abroad.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

Before this court, it was pleaded that both the parties have effected compromise. Therefore, this Court vide order dated 15.02.2015 directed both the parties to appear before the trial court for making their statements regarding the compromise. The report of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Batala has been received, wherein it is stated that the statements of complainant as well as the accused-petitioner have been recorded. The complainant has stated that he has now compromised the matter. It is also reported that the compromise is genuine and without any pressure.

In view of the compromise effected between the parties regarding the offence committed by the accused-petitioner punishable under Section 420 IPC, the impugned judgments passed by both the court below are set aside and the accused stands acquitted of the charges framed against him.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands allowed.

March 16, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE