IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr. Revision No. 349 of 2023
Date of Decision: 30.3.2026.

Sudhir Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

Shankar Sharma ...Respondent

Coram

Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1] ***No.***

For the Petitioner : Mr. Mukesh Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondent : Mr. Shubham Ghai, Advocate, vice Mr. Hemant Vaid, Advocate.

Rakesh Kainthla, Judge (Oral)

It has been stated on behalf of the respondent/complainant that the matter has been reconciled between the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has produced the receipt dated 2.9.2025, issued by Member Secretary, H.P. Legal Services Authority, Kasumpti, Shimla, regarding the deposit of ₹6,000/- being the 15% of the cheque amount of ₹40,000/-, which is taken on record.

---

[1] Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent/complainant, under instructions, submits that the matter has been reconciled between the parties and he has instructions not to press the complaint.

4. In view of this statement, the present revision is allowed and the judgment passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge (II), Shimla, District Shimla, H.P. in Criminal Appeal No.1-S/10 of 2019, titled Sudhir Kumar Vs. Shankar Sharma affirming the judgment of conviction dated 28.11.2018 and order of sentence dated 3.12.2018, passed by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Court No.7, Shimla, District Shimla, H.P, in Complaint No. 25-3 of 2017, titled Shankar Sharma Vs. Sudhir Kumar are ordered to be set aside and the complaint is dismissed as not pressed.

5. It has been submitted that ₹20,000/- have been deposited in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Court No.7, Shimla which has to be disbursed to the complainant in term of the compromise. Let the amount of ₹20,000/- deposited in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Court No.7, Shimla, HP, are ordered to be disbursed to the respondent/complainant by remitting the same to his bank

account on furnishing of the bank account details, if not furnished earlier.

6. It has been submitted that no other amount has been deposited before the learned Trial Court or this Court. In view of this, no other order is required to be passed for the disbursal of the amount by this Court.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of, so also the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

30th March, 2026
(Chander)