

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

FRIDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF MAY 2015/1ST JYAISHTA, 1937

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 618 of 2015 ()

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CRL.A 204/2014 of ADDL. SESSIONS COURT-II (SPL.
COURT), KOTTAYAM**

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN ST 66/2013 of J.M.F.C.-II, VAIKOM

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

**SHEEBA @ SHEEBA BIJU AGED 37 YEARS
W/O.BIJU, PATTAKUNNEL HOUSE, THIRUMARAYOOR P.O.
ARAKKUNNAM P.O., ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.M.M.ABDUL RAHIMAN

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANTS:

**1. SATHEESH KUMAR, AGED 50 YEARS
VETTATH (MUTTATH), ARUNNOOTTIMANGALAM P.O.
KULASEKHARAPURAM KARA, KADUTHURUTHY VILLAGE
VAIKOM TALUK - 686 604.**

**2. THE STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM - 682 031.**

R2 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT. MADHU BEN

**THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 22-05-
2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

K.HARILAL, J.

=====

Crl.R.P.No.618 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 22nd day of May, 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.204/2014 on the files of the Additional Sessions Judge-II (Special), Kottayam. The above appeal was filed challenging the judgment finding that the Revision Petitioner is guilty of the said offence, passed in S.T.No.66/2013 on the files of the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-II, Vaikom. According to the impugned judgment, the Revision Petitioner is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for two years and to pay cheque amount of ₹10,00,000/- as compensation under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C and in default of

payment of compensation, the accused shall undergo simple imprisonment for a further period of six months.

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. 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 'six' 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, this Revision Petition will stand disposed of subject to the following terms.

i. The Revision Petitioner shall undergo simple imprisonment for one day till rising of the court.

ii. The Revision Petitioner shall pay a compensation of Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten lakhs only) to the 1st respondent/complainant under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C. within a period of six months from today. If the petitioner had deposited any amount towards fine before the court below, the same shall be given credit to and the balance alone needs be paid as compensation. In that event, the complainant is allowed to realise the said deposit from the

court below.

iii. The Revision Petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court to suffer substantive sentence of simple imprisonment as ordered above on or before 23rd November, 2015 with sufficient proof to show payment of compensation .

iv. In default, the Revision Petitioner shall undergo simple imprisonment for a further period of six months.

The Criminal Revision Petition is disposed of accordingly.

**K.HARILAL,
JUDGE.**

stu

//True copy//

P.A to Judge