

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1612 OF 2011
ARISING OUT OF SLP(CRL) NO. 2094 OF 2011**

RAM SAWRUP

....

APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The respondent-complainant has been served but has not put in appearance.
3. The learned counsel for the appellant has drawn our attention to Annexures P6 and P7 to contend that the amount due to the complainant had been received by him and that he would have no objection if the complaint was dismissed. The High Court has, however, by the impugned order, declined to accept the compromise in the light of the fact that it had been entered into after the order had already been made by the High Court. Be that as it may, as of today nothing is due to the complainant from the appellant.

4. We, accordingly, feel that the ends of justice would be met if the proceedings against the appellant are quashed, the High Court order is set aside, and the appellant is acquitted.

5. The appeal stands disposed of in the above terms.

.....J
[HARJIT SINGH BEDI]

.....J
[GYAN SUDHA MISRA]

NEW DELHI
AUGUST 05, 2011.

