

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

**CRR No.4367 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : December 20, 2017**

Manjit Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Jamna Parshad

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate 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)

Office has reported that the petitioner has deposited 15% of the cheque amount being the litigation fees with the Legal Services committee of this Court, in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Damodar S. Prabhu v Sayed Babalal H., 2010(5) SCC 663.***

On the last date of hearing, learned counsel for the complainant-respondent stated that he has received the entire cheque amount of ₹35,000/- 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 01.06.2017 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated

18.04.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Calss, Jalandhar, 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 20, 2017

sarita	
Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No