

105  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 1567 of 2016 (O/M)  
Date of decision : 27.4.2016

Subhash Chand

..... Petitioner

Versus

Ram Kumar and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. B.S. Dhillon, Advocate, for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
  2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
  3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 16.4.2016, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, affirming the judgment of conviction dated 14.6.2013 and order of sentence dated 15.6.2013, passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kurukshetra, vide which the present petitioner was convicted under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months. The petitioner was directed to pay compensation equal to the cheque amount i.e. Rs. 4,00,000/- within two months, failing which the complainant shall be entitled to recover the same as per law.

CRR No. 1567 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the file.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the complainant had not disclosed the source of money. However, the copy of cross examination of the complainant shows that he had disclosed as to from where he got the money. He had also placed on record mutations Ex.C5 to C7, which shows that he has got the agriculture land. It is claimed that on account of friendly relations, the loan was advanced. No interest was to be charged. There are concurrent findings of two Courts below. There is no ground to interfere in the same. Hence, the present revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE

27.4.2016  
sjks