

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

**CRR No.3399 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : December 19, 2017**

Manoj Kumar Bhardwaj **Petitioner**

Versus

U.T. of Chandigarh and another **Respondents**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Patiyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate for
Mr. A.S. Virk, APP, U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Harshit Anand, 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 petitioner has produced the photocopy of the receipt No.124, dated 22.11.2017, showing that 10% of the cheque amount being the litigation fees, in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Damodar S. Prabhu v Sayed Babalal H., 2010(5) SCC 663***, has been deposited with the Legal Services Committee of this Court.

On 28.09.2017, learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 stated that the matter has been compromised and he has no objection if the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him. Now, the litigation fees has also been paid.

Since, the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 has been lawfully compounded, therefore, the judgment dated 14.09.2017 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated

10.08.2016 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh are hereby set aside and the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

As such, the present revision petition is allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

December 19, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No