

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 759 of 2016 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: FEBRUARY 24, 2016

RENU BANSAL AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

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. Gurcharan Dass, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

CRM No. 6323 of 2016

This is an application for placing on record documents (Annexures P-1 to P-4) and further for grant of exemption from filing certified copies of judgement dated 07.10.2014 passed by the Id. trial court.

Allowed as prayed for. Documents (Annexures P-1 to P-4) are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRM No.6325 of 2016

In view of the contents of the application, same is allowed.

CRM stands disposed of.

Main case

Challenge in this revision petition is to the order dated February 03, 2016 passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide which while dismissing the appeal preferred by the petitioners challenging the order dated October 07, 2014 passed by JMIC, Ludhiana convicting and sentencing the petitioners under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (for short, "Act") in criminal Complaint No. 9054, dated 25.03.2013, has been upheld.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that after the passing of order by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, the parties have arrived at a compromise and the matter has been put at rest by way of amicable settlement and compromise deed dated 16.02.2016 (Annexure P-1) has been put into black and white by the parties.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. RPS Sidhu, AAG, Punjab has accepted notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State whereas Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Bawa, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed power of attorney.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has admitted the factum of compromise effected in between the parties as well as the execution of the compromise deed dated 16.02.2016 (Annexure P-1), according to which, the payment of amount in question settled in between the parties is to be paid by the petitioner(s) by way of 17 installments but one thing is evident that there is amicable settlement between the parties and for the simple reason that the amount is to be paid by way of installments, it would not be desirable to keep the instant revision petition pending.

4. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have arrived at a compromise and there is no dispute left with either of the parties, the instant revision petition is accepted whereby the impugned judgment(s)/conviction order(s) passed by the trial court and upheld by the lower appellate court are set aside and the petitioner stands acquitted. However, while parting this order, it is made clear that in case, any of the terms and conditions stipulated in the compromise deed is violated by the petitioner(s), the respondent(s) shall be at liberty to approach this Court for the cancellation of this order.

CRM No.6324 of 2016

In view of the order passed in CRR No.759 of 2016, instant application has been rendered infructuous. As such, the same is dismissed being infructuous.

FEBRUARY 24, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE