

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

FRIDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/5TH ASHADHA, 1937

Cr1.Rev.Pet.No. 793 of 2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CRL.A.NO. 273/2012 of VIII
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT, ERNAKULAM DATED
22-09-2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CC 1355/2010 of J.F.C.M - VI,
ERNAKULAM DATED 29-02-2012

REVISION PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

SREEKUMAR, AGED 40 YEARS,
PROPRIETOR, GEE TECH TRADING COMPANY,
OPP. UC COLLEGE POST OFFICE,
ALUVA-683 101.

BY ADVS.SRI.JOMON P.VARGHESE
SRI.NIXON PAUL

RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT & STATE:

1. K.K.RAJAPPAN, PROPRIETOR,
BEN ELECTRONICS, PARAMARA BUILDINGS,
OPP. TOWN HALL, ERNAKULAM NORTH,
KOCHI-682 018.
2. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA,
ERNAKULAM-682 031.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.NIREESH MATHEW
R2 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI.JUSTINE JACOB

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP
FOR ADMISSION ON 26-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K. HARILAL, J.

Crl.R.P. No. 793 of 2015

Dated this the 26th 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.273 of 2012 on the files of the VIII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ernakulam. The above appeal was filed challenging the judgment finding that the Revision Petitioner is guilty of the said offence, passed in C.C.No.1355 of 2010 on the files of the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court-VI, Ernakulam. According to the impugned judgment, the Revision Petitioner is sentenced to pay a

fine of ₹1 lakh under Sec.138 of the N.I. Act. In default of payment of fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 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 fine as he is unable to raise the said amount forthwith due to paucity of funds, if this revision petition is found liable to be dismissed.

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 fine, I am inclined to grant four months time to pay the fine. Consequently, this Revision Petition will stand disposed of subject to the following terms.

i. The Revision Petitioner shall pay a fine of ₹1,00,000/- (Rupees One lakh only) under Sec.138 of the N.I. Act within a period of four months from today and the same shall be given to the 1st respondent/complainant as compensation under Sec.357 (1)(b) of the Cr.P.C.

ii. 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)

Nan/

//true copy//

P.S. to Judge