

**102+210 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM No.27841 of 2017 in/and
CRR No.1477 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision : September 27, 2017**

Amit Bansal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Lalit Garg and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Bhawna, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Pawan Garg, AAG, Haryana.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for complainant-respondent No.1 has affirmed the compromise effected between the parties and stated that the complainant-respondent No.1 has received ₹50,000/-, out of the settled amount i.e. ₹70,000/- and remaining is to be paid in installments and he has no objection if the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed to show leniency in the sentence awarded to the petitioner.

It comes out from the custody certificate dated 27.02.2017 that out of the rigorous imprisonment for six months, the petitioner has already undergone the total sentence of three months 14 days when he was released.

Considering that the parties have amicably settled their dispute, the sentence of rigorous imprisonment for six months awarded to the petitioner is reduced to the period already undergone by him.

As such, the present petition is partly allowed to the abovenoted extent.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

September 27, 2017
sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No