

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

Crl. Revision No. 3384 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.7.2018

Neelam

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. RS Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This is a revision that has been filed seeking challenge to the impugned order dated 13.8.2014, passed by the Additonal Sessions Judge, Karnal, and the judgment dated 25.4.2011 passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal, by which the respondent herein has been acquitted in case FIR No. 105 dated 3.5.2005 under Sections 406, 498-A, 323 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Butana.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner herein contends that both the courts below have not appreciated the evidence in its true context and have erroneously acquitted the respondent herein. It is argued that the private respondent ought to have been convicted for

offences punishable under Sections 406, 498-A, 323 and 506 of the Indian Penal.

Per contra, Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2, submits that there is no infirmity in the orders so passed. It is argued that there is very limited scope for interference by the this Court in revisional jurisdiction, particularly keeping in view the fact that both the courts below have correctly appreciated the evidence brought on record, while acquitting the respondent herein.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case which is pending in motion hearing since, 2014.

It is noted that notice of motion was issued only to the extent to explore the possibility of any amicable settlement. By order dated 10.1.2017, the parties had been directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement between the petitioner herein, who is the complainant, and the respondent. The mediation between the parties failed and this Court by order dated 19.3.2018 adjourned the matter again to allow the parties to see if any amicable settlement could be arrived at. This adjournment was given in view of the fact that the petitioner herein was in dire need of sustenance and maintenance since she had not preferred any petition under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure till date.

Today when the matter was taken up, respondent No.2 has agreed to pay a lumpsum ₹75,000/- to the petitioner herein in two equal installments.

In view of the said statement that has been made, the first

installment is to be paid on or before 27th August, 2018 and the second installment be paid before 27th December, 2018.

In view of the above settlement that has been arrived at, the instant revision is disposed of by giving liberty to the petitioner herein to revive the said petition, if need so arises.

26.7.2018
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No