

24

§-1 & 2

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

+ CRL. REV.P. 3/2016

ABHISHEK SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vijay Sharma, Advocate with  
petitioner from J/C.

versus

VIPIN KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through: Respondent in person.

**AND**

+ CRL. REV. 4/2016

ABHISHEK SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vijay Sharma, Advocate with  
petitioner from J/C.

versus

VIPIN KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through: Respondent in person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI**

**ORDER**

**12.07.2016**

%

1. These two revision petitions have been preferred by the petitioner Abhishek Sharma impugning the order dated 19.09.2015 dismissing the appeals bearing CA No.55/2015 (Old No.61/2012) and CA No.49/2015 (Old No.60/2012) filed by him challenging his conviction and the sentence awarded to him vide judgment and order on sentence dated 06.11.2012 and 17.11.2012 respectively in Complaint Cases No.437/09/2008 and

Crl.Rev.P.Nos.3/2016 & 4/2016

Page 1 of 3

Signature Not Verified

Signing Date:30.09.2024 17:11:45  
Certify that the digital and physical file have  
been compared and the digital data is as per  
the physical file and no page is missing.

438/09/2008 for committing the offence punishable under Section 138 NI Act, have been dismissed.

2. In pursuance of the production warrants issued, Petitioner Abhishek Sharma has been produced from J/C. Petitioner states that he is in custody for the last eleven months.

3. Without prejudice to the respective rights and contentions, the respondent Vipin Kumar in these cases submits that without any monetary consideration towards the liability under the cheques in question, he wants to compound the offence with the petitioner as he does not want the petitioner to further remain in custody in these cases. The respondent submits that the parties will continue with their civil litigations. The petitioner may not cause any threat or harm to the respondent or his family members because of their litigations wherein he has remained in jail.

4. The petitioner who is present in person assures the respondent not to apprehend any threat of harm to him or his family because of these litigations.

5. Both the parties have also made their submissions in writing to the above effect.

6. Both these revision petition pertains to conviction of the petitioner in the criminal complaints under Section 138 N.I. Act which have been compounded by the parties.

7. In view of the compounding of the offence in both the criminal complaints being complaint cases No. 437/09/2008 and 438/09/2008, the petitioner is acquitted in both the petitions being CrI.Rev.P.3/2016 & 4/2016.


8. Both the revision petitions stand disposed of.

9. A copy of the order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent with

26

direction to release the petitioner forthwith if not wanted in any other case.

10. A copy of the order be also given dasti to the learned counsel for the petitioner under the signature of the Court Master, as prayed.

  
PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JULY 12, 2016

'st'