

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

**CRR No.3439 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : November 28, 2017**

Balwinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

None for the complainant-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)

Office has reported that the litigation cost amounting to ₹40,000/- has been deposited with the Legal Services Committee of this Court.

It comes out from the order dated 25.09.2017 passed by this Court that the parties had compromised the matter. Learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 had appeared and stated that complainant-respondent No.2 has no objection if the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

Since the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 has been lawfully compounded and the litigation cost in terms of the authority of Hon'ble the Supreme Court delivered in case of ***“Damodar S. Prabhu v Sayed Babalal H., 2010(5) SCC 663***, has also been deposited, therefore, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 03.09.2014 passed by the learned Judicial

Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana as well as the judgment dated 12.09.2017

passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana are hereby set aside.

The petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

The bail bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner stand discharged.

As such, the present revision petition is allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 28, 2017

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No