



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

Sr. No.111+251

CRR-1996-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.08.2025

GURPREET SINGH

....Revisionist

Versus

HARBANS SINGH AND ANR

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Arvind Kashyap, Advocate for the revisionist.

Mr. Hardik Ahluwalia, Advocate for the complainant(s).

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

CRM-21171-2025

This is an application under Section 528 of BNSS for exemption from filing certified copies of the settlement dated 12.05.2025 (Annexure P-1) and photocopy of power of attorney dated 01.04.2025 (Annexure P-2) for placing on record the same.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed, and the learned counsel is granted exemption from filing certified/true typed copies of documents.

CRM-21172-2025

The instant application has been filed under Section 147 of Negotiable Instruments Act for compounding the offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed.

Main Case

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the matter has been



compromised with respondent/complainant and the revisionist has paid the compromised amount to the respondent/complainant. Learned counsel for the complainant admitted the factum of compromise regarding receiving of compromised amount from the revisionist. On the point of compounding fee learned counsel relied upon the case “*Damodar S. Prabhu Vs. Sayed Babalal, 2010(5) SCC 663*” wherein it is held that competent Court can reduce the cost with regard to specific facts and circumstances of the case and stated that it is the discretion of the Court and same be exercised in the present case as the revisionist is behind bars for the last 2 years and financially broken so a lenient view be taken in the matter of compounding fee.

Heard.

As the matter has already been compromised between the parties and revisionist has already paid the compromised amount which learned counsel for the respondent No.2 admits. In view of these circumstances, since the revisionist is behind bars for the last two years, and in view of law the ratio of laid as down in Damodar’s case (supra), the applicant-revisionist is directed to deposit Rs.20,000/- as compounding fee in the District Legal Service Authority concerned. As the matter has been compromised, so, revision is accepted. The impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence are set-aside. The concerned trial Court is directed to issue release warrant of the revisionist, at the earliest on production of receipt of costs of Rs.20,000/- which is to be deposited in District Legal Service Authority concerned.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

19.08.2025

mahima

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No