

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

**CRR No.4010 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : November 20, 2017**

Ranjoy Oswal @ Ranjan Jain **Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rajan Bhargava, Advocate for
Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

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)

As per office report, a sum of ₹15,000/- has been deposited with the Legal Services Committee of this Court.

It comes out from the last order that learned counsel for the parties had stated that the parties have compromised the matter. Respondent-complainant has no objection if the petitioner is acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him.

Today, 15% of the settled amount has been deposited before the Legal Services Committee of this Court, in terms of the judgment of the Apex Court delivered in case of “*Damodar S. Prabhu v Sayed babalal H., 2010(5) SCC 663*”, as composition fee.

Since the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 has been lawfully compounded and the composition fee has also been deposited, therefore, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 01.02.2016 passed by learned

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

27.10.2017 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, are hereby set aside. The petitioner stands acquitted of the notice of accusation served upon him. His bail bonds and surety bonds stand discharged.

The present revision petition is, accordingly, allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 20, 2017

sarita	
Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No