

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRR No. 1049 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.10.2017

GURDEEP SINGH

... Petitioner

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH.

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Makkad, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. I.P. Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2.

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 respondent No. 2 has stated that the entire payment has been received by the respondent No. 2 and the accounts have been settled. He further states that respondent No. 2 has no objection if the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

In the present case the cheque amount is of ₹36,800/-. Today, no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioner. In view of the facts and circumstances and the fact that learned counsel for the respondent No. 2 has stated that entire payment has been received by the respondent No. 2, the sentence awarded to the petitioner to under rigorous imprisonment for one year under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhari and affirmed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jagadhari, is hereby

reduced to the period already undergone by the petitioner while upholding the conviction of the petitioner under the said Section.

With this modification in the quantum of sentence of the petitioner as indicated herein above, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

October 11, 2017
Suresh Kumar

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	✓ Yes	/	No ✓
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	Yes	/	No