



CRR-1010-2024(O&M)

-1-

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

105

CRR-1010-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision : May 18, 2024

ARUNDEEP SINGH BHATTI @ ARUNDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. R.K.Kachura, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nakur Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant revision petition, the petitioner has assailed the verdict of conviction dated 7.5.2024 and consequent thereto order of sentence dated 11.12.2023, whereby, the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned has convicted the petitioner for commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as the 'N.I. Act'), and, sentenced him to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and six months along with compensation to the tune of the cheque amount i.e. Rs.7,79,600/- under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C.

2. Thereupon, the petitioner preferred statutory appeal before the learned Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, however, the said appeal was also



CRR-1010-2024(O&M)

-2-

dismissed vide judgment dated 7.5.2024, which propelled the petitioner to file the instant statutory revision before this Court under Section 401 Cr.P.C.

3. At the very outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that infact the matter has been compromised between the parties concerned and a separate application i.e. CRM-22110-2024 has also been filed alongwith the revision petition with a prayer for compounding of the offence.

4. Notice in the application.

5. Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab, waives service on behalf of the respondent-State, whereas, Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate has filed his duly executed *Vakalatname* in his favour on behalf of respondent No.2 and has admitted the factum of compromise and also extended no objection that in case the offence is compounded in view of the compromise arrived between the parties.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties concerned and has gone through the record with their able assistance.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shakuntla Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63***, speaking through Justice V.R.Krishna Iyer, has held as under:-

“4.The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.....”

8. Keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably



CRR-1010-2024(O&M)

-3-

settled *inter se* the parties, and that, the offence in question is compoundable, and that, compounding can be allowed at any stage, this Court is constrained to allow the instant petition.

9. Consequently, the instant revision petition is **allowed**, and, the petitioner is **acquitted** of the charges/notice of accusation framed against him. The impugned verdict of conviction and order of sentence dated 11.12.2023, as passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ferozepur, is set aside *qua* the petitioner. Moreover, the impugned verdict dated 7.5.2024, whereby, the learned Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, had upheld the conviction of the petitioner, is also *set aside qua* the petitioner.

10. The petitioner is directed to be released from custody, if not required in any other case. His bail bonds and surety bonds, if any, also stand discharged.

11. All pending application(s) stand disposed of accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

May 18, 2024
ajay-1

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No