

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

MONDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/18TH JYAISHTA, 1937

Cr1.Rev.Pet.No. 685 of 2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN Cr1.A 36/2014 of SESSIONS COURT,KASARAGOD

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CC 1053/2012 of JUDICIAL FIRST CLASS
MAGISTRATE COURT-II,HOSDRUG

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

VENU P. AGED 53 YEARS
S/O.PERAYIL KUNHAMBUR NAIK, R/A.KANATHIL VEEDU
POST ATTENGANAM, HOSDURG TALUK, KASARAGOD DISTRICT-671531

BY ADVS.SRI.K.SHRIHARI RAO
SMT.N.SHOBHA
SRI.A.S.SREEKANTH

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT:

1. T.A.ABDUL RAHIMAN, AGED 55 YEARS
S/O.MADAMILLATH MOHAMMED KUNHI, R/A.JUMA MASJID ROAD
KOTTIKULAM, HOSDURG TALUK, KASARAGOD DISTRICT
POST BEKAL 671318

2. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM-682031

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI.JIBU.P.THOMAS.

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 08-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

STU

K.HARILAL, J.

=====

Crl.R.P.No.685 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 8th 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.36/2014 on the files of the Sessions Judge, Kasaragod. The above appeal was filed challenging the judgment finding that the Revision Petitioner is guilty of the said offence, passed in C.C.No.1053/2012 on the files of the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-II, Hosdurg. According to the impugned judgment, the Revision Petitioner is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for one day till rising of the court and to pay an amount of ₹2,20,000/- as compensation to the complainant. In default

of payment, the revision petitioner shall undergo simple imprisonment for a period of three months. If the amount is realised, the same shall be paid to the complainant 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. 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 sometime to pay the compensation as he is unable to raise the said amount forthwith due to paucity of funds.

6. 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.

7. 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. 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 ₹2,20,000/- (Rupees Two lakhs Twenty thousands only) to the 1st respondent/complainant within a period of six months from today under Section 357(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

iii. The Revision Petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court to suffer substantive sentence of simple imprisonment as ordered above on or before 8th December, 2015 with sufficient proof to show payment of compensation .

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

The Criminal Revision Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
K.HARILAL, JUDGE.

stu

//True copy//

P.A to Judge