

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

WEDNESDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JULY 2015/31ST ASHADHA, 1937

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 712 of 2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN ST 871/2011 of J.M.F.C., ADIMALI
DATED 11-01-2013

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CRL.A.NO. 24/2013 of I ADDITIONAL
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COUORT, THODUPUZHA, DATED
05-02-2014.

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/APPELLANT/ACCUSED :

DURAIPANDY, AGED 49 YEARS,
S/O. MUTHUPANDY, SALOM NIVAS, DEVIKULAM P.O.,
DEVIKULAM TALUK, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.LATHEESH SEBASTIAN

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT & STATE :

1. JAMEELA,
W/O. SALIM, MANALIKKUDY HOUSE, ADIMALY P.O.,
MANNAMKANDAM VILLAGE, DEVIKULAM TALUK,
IDUKKI DISTRICT-685586.

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

R1 BY ADV. SRI.S.JIJI

R2 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI. JUSTINE JACOB

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP
FOR ADMISSION ON 22-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K. HARILAL, J.

Crl.R.P. No.712 of 2015

Dated this the 22nd day of July, 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.24 of 2013 on the files of the I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Thodupuzha. The above appeal was filed challenging the judgment finding that the Revision Petitioner is guilty of the said offence, passed in S.T. Case No.871 of 2011 on the files of the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-I, Adimaly. According to the impugned judgment, the Revision Petitioner is

sentenced to undergo imprisonment till rising of the court and to pay an amount of ₹4 lakhs as compensation under Sec.357(3) of the Cr.P.C. to the complainant within 30 days from today. In default of payment of compensation, the accused will undergo simple imprisonment for three 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 Sec.138 of the N.I. Act. The learned counsel further sought for

some time to pay the compensation, in case this revision petition is found meritless, 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 ₹4,00,000/- (Rupees Four lakhs only) to the 1st respondent as compensation within a period of six months from today under Sec.357(3) of the Cr.P.C.

iii. The Revision Petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court to suffer substantive sentence of simple imprisonment as ordered above on or before 22/1/2016 with sufficient proof to show payment of compensation.

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

v. If the revision petitioner had deposited any amount in the trial court towards compensation or fine, the same shall be given credit to and the balance alone needs to be paid as compensation or fine, as the case may be, and in that event, the complainant is allowed to realise such deposit from the court.

The Criminal Revision Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

(K. HARILAL, JUDGE)

Nan/

//true copy//

P.S. to Judge