

206

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 561 of 2016 (O/M)
Date of decision : 10.10.2017

Lalit Revisionist
Versus
Sanjay Kumar Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Mukesh Mittal, Advocate, for revisionist.
Mr. Gulshan Nandwani, Advocate, for respondent-complainant.

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)

The learned counsel for respondent-complainant states that he has received the balance amount also. In this way, his claim is satisfied.

The learned counsel for revisionist states that revisionist is not in a sound financial position to pay 15% of cheque amount, as per the authority of Apex Court in Damodar S. Prabhu Versus Sayed Babalal H., 2010 (5) SCC 663, to the Legal Services Committee of this Court and prays for reducing the substantive sentence to the period already undergone by him.

As such, the substantive sentence of simple imprisonment for one year, awarded by the lower Court under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, is reduced to the period already undergone by revisionist. The compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- has already been paid to complainant.

With the abovenoted modification, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

10.10.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes
Whether Reportable : No