

\$~20/21/22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.REV.P. 524/2014 and Crl. M.A. No. 960/2016

PANKAJ PAHWA Petitioner
Through : Mr. Pawan Kumar Mittal, Adv. with
petitioner in person.
versus

HARI OM MEHRA Respondent
Through Mr. Rahul Rohtagi, Adv. with
respondent in person.

AND

+ CRL.REV.P. 585/2014 and Crl. M.A. No. 959/2016

PANKAJ PAHWA Petitioner
Through : Mr. Pawan Kumar Mittal, Adv. with
petitioner in person.
versus

HARI OM MEHRA Respondent
Through : Mr. Rahul Rohtagi, Adv. with
respondent in person.

AND

+ CRL.REV.P. 587/2014 and Crl. M.A. No. 961/2016

PANKAJ PAHWA Petitioner
Through : Mr. Pawan Kumar Mittal, Adv. with
petitioner in person.
versus

HARI OM MEHRA Respondent
Through Mr. Rahul Rohtagi, Adv. with
respondent in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER
% **08.07.2016**

1. Respondent (complainant) filed three complaints under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ("the Act", for short) against the petitioner (accused) in respect of three cheques of different amounts being CC Nos. 303/1, 312/1 and 316/1 before the Metropolitan Magistrate (West), Delhi. After trial, petitioner was convicted in all the three cases vide separate judgments dated 14th May, 2009 and 15th May, 2009. Petitioner was also sentenced in all the three cases for six months each and varied amounts of fine was imposed. Petitioner preferred three appeals before the Sessions Judge against his conviction and sentence. Appeals have also been dismissed by the Sessions Judge.
2. That is how petitioner is before this Court by way of aforesaid revision petitions.
3. During the pendency of revision petitions, petitioner and respondent have settled their disputes before the Mediation Centre, Rohini Courts, Delhi on 6th January, 2016 regarding payments involved in the cheques. Certain other cases pending between the parties have also been settled before the

Mediation Centre and a common Settlement Agreement dated 6th January, 2016 has been signed by and between the parties. Photocopy of the Settlement Agreement has been placed on record.

4. Respondent (complainant) admits having received the settled amount in terms of the settlement agreement, except what is lying deposited in this Court. Both the parties pray for compounding of the offence. Private respondent has no objection, in case amounts lying deposited in this Court are released to the respondent no.1 along with interest accrued thereon.

5. In view of the settlement arrived at by and between the parties before the Mediation Centre and also keeping in mind that petitioner has honoured the settlement, the matter is permitted to be compounded and petitioner is acquitted in all the three cases. Registry is directed to release the amounts lying deposited in this Court in the shape of FDR along with interest accrued thereon to the respondent no.1 forthwith.

6. Revision petitions are disposed of in the above terms. Miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JULY 08, 2016/rb