

Shiv

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.59 OF 2022

Dhanraj Meghraj Rajpal

...Appellant

vs.

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Kishor Bhatia for the Appellant.

Mr. H. J. Dedhia APP for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Arun Mehta i/b Akshar Laws for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

Mr. Dhanraj M. Rajpal, Appellant in person present.

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATED : 13TH APRIL 2023

P. C. :

1. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicant-complainant, learned APP for the Respondent-State and learned Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

2. Respondent Nos.3 and 4 are the Directors of Respondent No.2-company. The Applicant has filed two complaints for the offence punishable under section 138 of the NI Act. In the present complaint, there are two cheques involved, whereas in another compliant only one cheque is involved.

3. So far as present Appeal is concerned, leave has already been

granted. Whereas there was Criminal Application No.36 of 2017, filed by the Applicant seeking leave to prefer an Appeal thereby challenging the judgment of acquittal in another complaint.

4. This Court as per order dated 15th December 2021, was pleased to ask the Applicant to furnish address of Respondent Nos.2 to 4. For non-compliance, the Application was dismissed. So that application no more survives.

5. Now the Appellant and Respondent Nos.3 and 4 have settled the dispute and Respondent Nos.3 and 4 have agreed to pay Rs.50,00,000/- to the Appellant/Applicant by way of demand drafts and cheque. The consent terms are executed. They are signed by the Applicant and Respondent Nos.3 and 4 and their respective Advocates. The same is taken on record and marked as Annexure "X". The details of demand draft and cheques are given in the Consent Terms.

6. In view of above, the Applicant do not want to prosecute this Appeal. Hence, the Appeal is disposed of.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]