

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

WEDNESDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/20TH JYAISHTA, 1937

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 3300 of 2003

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN Crl.A.No.260/2002 OF THE SESSIONS COURT, MANJERI
DATED 30-10-2003**

**C.C.No.2/2001 OF JUDICIAL FIRST CLASS MAGISTRATE COURT, NILAMBUR
DATED 17-09-2002**

REVISION PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED :-

**MADATHIL ABDUL KABEER, S/O.MOHAMMED,
NILAMBUR AMSOM P.O.,
CHANTHAKUNNU, NILAMBUR,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.BABU S. NAIR
SMT.SWAPNA HASSAN**

RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANT/STATE :-

- 1. SUDHAKARAN NAIR, S/O.CHELLAPPAN,
P.O.MODAPPOIKA, VAZHIKADAVU,
NILAMBUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.**
- 2. THE STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY
THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA,
ERNAKULAM, KOCHI - 31.**

R2 BY SRI.JUSTINE JACOB, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

**THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
10-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

K.HARILAL, J

Crl.R.P.No.3300 of 2003

Dated this the 10th day of June, 2015

ORDER

This Revision Petition is filed challenging the concurrent findings of conviction entered and the sentence imposed on the Revision Petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, 'the N.I. Act') in Criminal Appeal No.260/2002 on the files of the Sessions Judge, Manjeri. The above appeal was filed challenging the judgment finding that the Revision Petitioner is guilty of the said offence, passed in C.C.No.2/2001 on the files of the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court, Nilambur. According to the impugned judgment, the Revision Petitioner is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one month and to pay a fine of ₹5,000/- and in default to undergo simple imprisonment for one month. The fine amount shall be given to the complainant as compensation under Section 357(1)

Cr.P.C.

2. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner reiterated the contentions which were raised before the courts below and got rejected concurrently. The learned counsel urged for a re-appreciation of evidence once again, which is not permissible under the revisional jurisdiction unless any kind of perversity is found in the appreciation of evidence. Complainant's case is that the accused borrowed an amount of ₹1 lakh and in discharge of the said liability, Ext.P1 cheque was issued in his favour. But in defence the accused contended that he had borrowed an amount of ₹10,000/- only from one Mr.Pradeep and give a signed blank cheque as security to him. But no evidence has been adduced to show the possibility of such a defence version at least with the yard stick of the preponderance of probability except the oral assertion of the accused. Nothing brought out and in the cross examination of the complainant to probabalise the version of the accused. The Revision Petitioner failed to point out any kind of perversity in the appreciation of evidence or illegality or impropriety in the

findings whereby the trial court convicted him.

3. The courts below had concurrently found that the complainant/1st respondent had successfully discharged initial burden of proving execution and issuance of the cheque; whereas the Revision Petitioner had failed to rebut the presumption under Section 118(a) and 139 of the N.I. Act which stood in favour of the 1st respondent. So also, it is found that the debt due to the 1st respondent was a legally enforceable debt and Ext.P1 cheque was duly executed and issued in discharge of the said debt.

4. This Court is satisfied that the courts below had meticulously evaluated the evidence on record. I do not find any kind of illegality or impropriety in the said findings or perversity in appreciation of evidence, from which the above findings had been arrived. Therefore, I am not inclined to re-appreciate entire evidence once again and I confirm the concurrent findings of conviction.

5. At last, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner submits that the sentence imposed on the Revision Petitioner is

disproportionate with the gravity and nature of the offence contemplated under Section 138 of the N.I.Act. The learned counsel further sought for some time to pay the compensation as he is unable to raise the said amount forthwith due to paucity of funds.

6. Similarly, the substantive sentence imposed on the revision petitioner is too harsh and excessive. The learned counsel for the revision petitioner prayed for setting aside the sentence of imprisonment also. If the revision petitioner is incarcerated for a period as ordered by the courts below, the entire family will put in great hardship.

7. The Supreme Court, in the decision in ***Kaushalya Devi Massand v. Roopkishore*** (AIR 2011 SC 2566), held that the offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act is almost in the nature of civil wrong which has been given criminal overtone, and imposition of fine payable as compensation is sufficient to meet the ends of justice. Further, in ***Vijayan vs. Baby*** (2011 (4) KLT 355), Supreme Court held that the direction to pay the compensation by way of restitution in regard to the loss on

account of the dishonour of the cheque should be practical and realistic. So, in a prosecution under Section 138 of the N.I. Act, the compensatory aspect of remedy should be given much priority over punitive aspect.

8. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the offence, in the light of the decisions quoted above and submission made at the Bar, expressing willingness to pay the compensation, I am inclined to grant three months time to pay the compensation. Similarly, the substantive sentence of imprisonment is reduced and modified to simple imprisonment for one day till rising of the court. Consequently, in supersession of the sentence imposed by the trial court and conferred by the Appellate Court, the Revision Petitioner will stand sentenced as given below;

i) The revision petitioner shall undergo simple imprisonment for one day till rising of the court.

ii) He shall pay a sum of ₹1,00,000/-(Rupees one lakh only) to the complainant, within a period of three months from today, as compensation under Section 357(3) of the Cr.P.C. If

the revision petitioner had deposited any amount in the trial court , in compliance with the direction of this Court, the same shall be given credit to and the balance alone needs to be paid as compensation. In that event, the complainant is allowed to realise such deposit, if any.

iii) He shall appear before the Trial Court to suffer the substantive sentence of simple imprisonment for one day till rising of the court on or before 10th September,2015 with sufficient proof to show payment of compensation.

iv) In default, the revision petitioner shall undergo simple imprisonment for a period of two months.

The Criminal Revision Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
K.HARILAL
JUDGE

rkj

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE