

CRR No.2867 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : November 16, 2017

..... Petitioner

Versus

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. R.S. Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

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 petitioner has produced the copy of receipt of ₹10,000/- showing that the petitioner has deposited the litigation costs with the Legal Services Committee of this Court, as per authority of Hon'ble the Supreme Court delivered in case of ***“Damodar S. Prabhu v Sayed Babalal H., 2010(5) SCC 663.*** The same is taken on record. The office has also made report in this regard.

On the last date of hearing, complainant was present along with his counsel and stated that he has effected a compromise with the petitioner and the entire settled amount i.e. ₹3,50,000/- has been paid to him as full and final settlement of the disputed amount. The complainant-respondent has no objection if the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

Since, the matter has been lawfully compounded and the litigation costs has also been paid, therefore, the judgment dated 13.07.2017

passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad, as well as the judgment of

conviction dated 10.08.2015 and order of sentence dated 14.08.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate, Faridabad, convicting and sentencing the petitioner, are hereby set aside and the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon. The bail bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner stand discharged.

As such, the present revision petition is allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 16, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No