

14# \$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.A. 945/2017 and Crl. M.A. Nos. 16689/2017 and 16690/2017
and Crl. M.B. No. 1768/2017

DILSHAD AHMED & ORS

..... Appellants

Represented by: Mr. Habibur Rahman,
Advocate.

versus

STATE (GNCTD) & ANR

..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr. Amit Gupta, APP for State
with SI Arvind Kumar, PS
Jaitpur.

Ms. Anju Thoma, Ms. Nupur
Kumar and Mr. Arnav
Vidyarthi, Advocates for Mr.
Sunil Fernandes, Standing
Counsel for BSES Rajdhani
with Mr. Pradeep Basoya,
Assistant Legal Manager in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

04.04.2018

%

1. The appellants have preferred the present appeal challenging the impugned judgment dated 14th July, 2017 convicting appellant No. 1 Dilshad Ahmed for offence punishable under Section 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and appellant Nos. 2 and 3, that is, Munna Khan and Ms. Jahida Khan for offences punishable under Section 135 read with Section 150 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

CRL.A. 945/2017

Page 1 of 2

2. Vide order on sentence dated 26th July, 2017 appellants were directed to pay a fine of ₹1,00,500/- and in default of payment of fine to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month, besides rigorous imprisonment for a period of three months. The civil liability amount adjudicated against the appellants was a sum of ₹67,000/-.

3. Parties wanted to negotiate a settlement and thus the matter was referred to Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre. Report of the learned Mediator dated 20th December, 2017 has been received. As per the settlement since the respondent No. 2 BSES Rajdhani agreed to payment of civil liability, that is, ₹67,000/- thus ₹ 83,000/- has been refunded to the appellants by way of a cheque.

4. Mr. Pradeep Basoya, Assistant Legal Manager, BSES Rajdhani is present in Court and is identified by the learned counsel. He affirms the settlement arrived at between the parties on 20th December, 2017 before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre and states that now the respondent No.2 has no claims whatsoever against the appellants qua the outstanding bill and does not wish to pursue the complaint against the appellants.

5. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties and that the amount as settled has already been paid to respondent No. 2, the impugned judgment of conviction dated 14th July, 2017 and order on sentence dated 26th July, 2017 are set aside. Appeal and all pending applications are accordingly disposed of.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

**APRIL 04, 2018/‘vn’
CRLA. 945/2017**

Page 2 of 2