

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Crl. Misc. No.M- 33255 of 2014
Date of Decision: 25.04.2016

Punjab Oils, through its proprietor
Harpreet Singh

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

M/s. Hari Kewal Private Ltd. and others

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Swapan Shorey, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate for the respondent.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner-Punjab Oils, through its proprietor Harpreet Singh, has filed this petition challenging the order dated 01.09.2014(Annexure P-1) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar in *Complaint No.2471*, dated 07.02.2013 titled as "Punjab Oils Vs. M/s. Hari Kewal Pvt. Ltd." vide which the complaint was ordered to be returned to the complainant for being presented before a court of competent jurisdiction in view of the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Dashrath Rup Singh Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra and another 2014(3) RCR (Crl.) 904.**

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that although the complaint was ordered to be returned to the complainant in view of the decision given by the Apex Court but

subsequently Ministry of Law and Justice (Legislative Department) had issued an ordinance which came into force on 15.06.2015. As per the same, the complaint could be presented in the Court within whose jurisdiction the cheque in question had been presented for encashment or before the Court within whose jurisdiction, the Bank of the drawer of the cheque was situated. Thereafter, another similar ordinance was issued on 22.09.2015. In the present case, the cheque in question was presented for encashment with the HDFC Bank at Majith Mandi, Amritsar, hence, the Court at Amritsar had the jurisdiction to try the case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon *CRM-M-No.41124 of 2014 titled as M/s Mohindra Engineering Works Vs. Chamkaur Singh decided on 29.09.2015, CRM-M-6308-2015 titled as The Patiala Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Vs. Seema decided on 04.08.2015 and CRM-M-33847-2014 titled as M/S Said Deep Traders Vs. Shree Gusaiji Traders and others decided on 14.09.2015 by this Hon'ble Court.*

Learned counsel for the respondent has opposed the instant petition and has argued that there is no illegality in the order passed by the learned trial Court and the complaint is required to be filed at a different place as provided in **Dashrath Rup Singh Rathod's case(supra.**

Para 3 of the ordinance dated 15.06.2015 reads as under:-

“In the principal Act, section 142 shall be numbered as sub-section (1) thereof and after sub-section (1) as so numbered, the following sub-section be

inserted, namely:-

“(2) The offence under Section 138 shall be inquired into and tried only by a court within whose local jurisdiction,

(a) if the cheque is delivered for collection through an account, the branch of the bank where the payee or holder in due course, as the case may be, maintains the account, is situated; or

(b) if the cheque is presented for payment by the payee or holder in due course otherwise through an account, the branch of the drawee bank where the drawer maintains the account, is situated.

Explanation.-For the purposes of clause (a), where a cheque is delivered for collection at any branch of the bank of the payee or holder in due course, then, the cheque shall be deemed to have been delivered to the branch of the bank in which the payee or holder in due course, as the case may be, maintains the account.”

Para 3 of the ordinance dated 22.09.2015 reads as under:-

“In the principal Act, Section 142 shall be numbered as sub-section (1) thereof and after sub-section (1) as so numbered, the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:-

(2) The offence under section 138 shall be inquired into and tried only by a court within whose local jurisdiction,

(a) if the cheque is delivered for collection through an account, the branch of the bank where the payee or holder in due course, as the case may be, maintains the account, is situated; or

(b) if the cheque is presented for payment by the payee or holder in due course otherwise through an account, the branch of the drawee bank where the drawer maintains the account, is situated.

Explanation.--For the purposes of clause(a), where a cheque is delivered for collection at any branch of the bank of the payee or holder in due course, then, the cheque shall be deemed to have been delivered to the branch of the bank in which the payee or holder in due course, as the case may be maintains the account.”

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

As per the above ordinance and the amendment made in Section 142 (a) of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, the Court within whose jurisdiction, the cheque in question is presented for encashment is competent to try the complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. Impugned order dated 01.09.2014 is set aside and the trial Court is directed to dispose of the complaint in question in accordance with law.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

April 25, 2016
'Anjal'