

**102+201 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM No.29509 of 2017 in/and
CRR No.1673 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : October 13, 2017**

M/s Shruti Bulk Drugs Ltd. and others Petitioners

Versus

M/s Surya Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. J.S. Gill, Advocate for
Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the respondent.
Ms. Ashima Mor, APP, U.T., Chandigarh.

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 the petitioners has produced the copy of the receipt, showing that the petitioner has deposited ₹1,50,000/- with the Legal Services Committee of this Court, in terms of the last order, being 15% of the settled amount, as per authority of Hon'ble the Supreme Court delivered in case of ***“Damodar S. Prabhu v Sayed Babalal H., 2010 (5) SCC 663.***

In the last order dated 15.09.2017, it was recorded that the parties have amicably compromised the matter and settled the dispute at ₹10,00,000/-. Learned counsel for the complainant stated that the complainant has received ₹10,00,000/- in full and final settlement of his claim and he has no objection, if the offence is compounded and the petitioners are acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon them.

Now, the petitioners have deposited 15% of the settled amount

SARITA RANI
2017.10.13 17:57
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

and litigation cost with the Legal Services Committee of this Court.

As the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, the present revision petition is allowed and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.02.2011 passed learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh, convicting the petitioner for the commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and sentencing him to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay compensation of ₹60,00,000/- as wells as the judgment dated 12.12.2013, passed by learned Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, dismissing the appeal of the petitioner, are hereby set aside. The bail bond and surety bond of petitioner No.2 stand discharged.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

October 13, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No