

Present: Mr. R.S. Dhull, Advocate
for the revisionist(s).

Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate, has put in appearance and filed Vakalatnama on behalf of complainant-respondent No. 2, which is taken on record.

The learned counsel for revisionist has brought demand draft No. 852636 dated 23.08.2017, of Vijaya Bank, Kaithal, Haryana, in favour of complainant-respondent No. 2, for an amount of ₹20,000/-, in Court today. The same has been handed over to the learned counsel for complainant-respondent No. 2 and photocopy of the same has been retained on file.

Let revisionist also deposit 15% of the cheque amount i.e. ₹3,000/- with the Legal Service Committee of this Court, as per the guidelines of Apex Court in Damodar S. Prabhu Vs. Sayed Babalal H., 2010 (5) SCC 663.

At this stage, the learned counsel for revisionist states that he will deposit 15% of the cheque amount i.e. ₹ 3,000/- today itself with the Legal Services Committee of this Court.

In view of the matter, the case be again put up today after lunch after depositing of 15% of the cheque amount alongwith receipt thereof.

September 7, 2017

Suresh Kumar

**[KULDIP SINGH]
JUDGE**

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

CRR No. 2689 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.09.2017

DHARMPAL ALIAS PAPPU

... Petitioner

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH.

Present: Mr. R.S. Dhull, Advocate,
for revisionist.

Mr. Pawan Garg, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arun Sharma, 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)

Case has been taken after lunch. As per the report of office, ₹3,000/- have been deposited with the Legal Services Committee of this Court.

It comes out that the parties have compromised. Revisionist has paid the amount of cheque to complainant (respondent No. 2), which has been affirmed by the learned counsel for complainant-respondent No. 2 in Court today.

Since, the offence has been lawfully compounded, therefore, revision is allowed. The impugned judgment of conviction dated 30.08.2016 and order of sentence dated 01.09.2016, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kaithal, convicting and sentencing the revisionist under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, and the judgment dated 01.07.2017, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal are

hereby set aside. The petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation, served upon him. He be released forthwith, if not required in any other case.

September 7, 2017
Suresh Kumar

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

✓

Whether speaking / reasoned

:

Yes

/

No

✓

Whether Reportable

:

Yes

/

No