**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**Cr. MMO No. 475 of 2026**
**Date of Decision: 01.10.2026.**

---

Dheeraj Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. ...Respondents

---

*Coram*
***Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.***
***Whether approved for reporting?[1] No***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the Petitioner | : | Mr. Lakshay Parihar, Advocate. |
| For Respondent No.1 | : | Mr. Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General. |
| For Respondent No.2 | : | Mr. Vipul Sharma, 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 two separate receipts dated 30.09.2026 and 01.10.2026, issued by Member Secretary, H.P. Legal Services Authority, Kasumpti, Shimla, regarding the deposit of ₹67,500/- and 38,250/- (total

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

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 11:23:08 :::CIS

₹1,05,750/- being the 15% of the cheque amount of ₹7,05,000/-, which are taken on record.

3. The record shows that the petitioner/accused was convicted and sentenced by learned Trial Court. The petitioner/accused unsuccessfully challenged his conviction and sentence before learned First Appellate Court and before this Court in Cr. Revision No. 61 of 2024 titled Dheerj Kumar versus Sanjeev Kumar decided on 20.11.2025.

4. The Division Bench of this Court held in ***Chune Ram vs. Brikam Chand, 2025:HHC:38122 decided on 13.11.2025*** that the Court can quash the conviction even after its finalization in criminal revision based on the compromise effected between the parties. This judgment is binding upon this Court.

5. In view of this judgment, the present petition is allowed and the conviction and sentence awarded by the learned Trial Court as affirmed by learned Appellate Court and by this Court in Cr. Revision No. 61 of 2024 titled Dheerj Kumar versus Sanjeev Kumar decided on 20.11.2025 are ordered to be quashed.

6. It has been submitted that ₹3,60,000/- have been deposited before the Registry of this Court which has to be

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 11:23:08 :::CIS

disbursed to the respondent/complainant in terms of the compromise. Let the amount of ₹3,60,000/-, deposited before the Registry of this Court are ordered to be disbursed to the respondent/complainant by remitting the same to his bank account alongwith upto date interest on furnishing of the bank account details if not furnished earlier. It has been stated that no other amount has been deposited; hence no other order is required to be passed regarding release of the amount.

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

**(Rakesh Kainthla)**
**Judge**

1st October, 2026
(Nikita)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 09/11/2026 11:23:08 :::CIS