

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

Anuradha
21/11/11 17:23
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

127

**CRM-M-40295-2016
Decided on : 10.11.2016**

Nishu

....Petitioner

Versus

Ankit Anand

...Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. B.S. Tewatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing the order dated 08.09.2016 whereby the application moved by petitioner for additional evidence was dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that ultimately complaint under Section 138 Negotiable Instruments Act can also be categorized as a money dispute and even if the witnesses now sought to be examined were inadvertently not mentioned in the original list of witnesses the complainant can be compensated by costs.

In my considered opinion, the argument is meritorious.

In the circumstance, the petition stands allowed and trial court is directed to grant one opportunity to examine the two witnesses cited in the

application at her own responsibility subject to the payment of Rs. 20,000/-
as costs to the complainant.

Petition stands allowed.

November 10, 2016

anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No