

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

CRR-5012-2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: January 08, 2016

Parveen Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

M/s Gupta Steel Traders and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

- 1. *Whether Reporters of local papers 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?***

Present: Mr.Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sunil Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr.Sanjay Kumar Saini, AAG, Haryana
for respondent No.2.

.....

NARESH KUMAR SANGHI, J.(ORAL)

Challenge in the present criminal revision petition is to the judgement, dated 30.11.2015, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, whereby appeal filed by the petitioner challenging his conviction and sentence for the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable

Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter to be referred as the 'N.I.Act'), recorded by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Faridabad, was dismissed.

Notice of motion was issued on 24.12.2015 in the revision petition as well as in the application for suspension of sentence. As a sequel thereto, Mr.Sunil Kumar, Advocate, has put in appearance for respondent No.1, while Mr.Sanjay Kumar Saini, AAG, Haryana, has appeared for the State, i.e. respondent No.2. All the counsels representing the respective parties are *ad idem* that in view of the compromise so effected between the parties the present criminal revision petition can be disposed of at this stage. They are further in unison that in view of the provisions contained in Section 147 of the N.I.Act, offence punishable under Section 138 of the N.I.Act is compoundable and if the Court permits the parties to compound the offence, then the accused can be acquitted of the charge levelled against him.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, statement on oath of Dharmender Kumar, who is proprietor of respondent No.1, was recorded separately in which he admitted the factum of compromise with the petitioner and deposed that he had no objection if the petitioner was acquitted of the charge

levelled against him on the basis of compromise. He further fairly admitted that a sum of ₹6,00,000/- (Rupees six lacs only) was received by him from the petitioner side.

Since the offence punishable under Section 138 of the N.I.Act is compoundable as per provisions contained in Section 147 of the N.I.Act, therefore, this Court permits the party to compound the offence. It is settled law that the Court can permit the parties to effect a compromise in a compoundable offence even at the stage of pendency of the revision petition.

After perusing the statement suffered by proprietor of respondent No.1, it is crystal clear that a valid compromise has been effected between the private parties to the present petition. The cheque was issued on account of a business dealing and now the private parties have resolved their dispute, therefore, this Court finds that the said order can be modified and the revision petition can be decided on merits taking into consideration the compromise. Hence, the judgments passed by both the Courts below holding the petitioner guilty for the offence punishable under Section 138 of the N.I.Act and order of sentence to undergo RI for one year besides payment of compensation of ₹7,00,000/- (Rupees seven lacs only) and in default thereof to undergo

further simple imprisonment of three months are set aside and the petitioner, Parveen Kumar, Proprietor Roda Iron & Steel Company, B-250, Nehru Ground, NIT Faridabad, Tehsil and District Faridabad, is acquitted of the charge levelled against him.

Since the petitioner is in custody, therefore, he be set at liberty at once, if not required in any other case.

Disposed of.

January 08, 2016
meenu

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE