

211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 290 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 12.12.2017

Dr. Rishi Raj Pal Singh

..... Revisionist

Versus

Nehpal Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- None for revisionist.

Mr. N.S. Shekhawat, Advocate, for respondent.

Mr. R.K. Makkad, DAG Haryana.

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)

Heard.

The learned State counsel states that revisionist is changing his location, and has switched off his phone and is not traceable. Therefore, he could not be traced out. The efforts are on to arrest him.

Since today again, none has appeared for revisionist, this Court has proceeded to consider the case of revisionist on merits and dispose of same.

Revisionist has been convicted under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months in addition to compensation to complainant, equal to cheque amount i.e. Rs. 15,00,000/-, vide judgment of conviction dated 19.5.2015 and order of sentence dated 20.5.2015, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gurgaon. The judgment was upheld

CRR-290-2017 (O/M)

by the lower appellate Court.

The perusal of judgments shows that cheque issued by revisionist was dishonoured due to insufficient funds. The lower Court has examined the evidence and the stand taken by revisionist-accused in statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C.. In the said statement, he admitted that he wanted to purchase land from complainants, but stated that he had issued blank signed security cheque. He claims that complainants have sold the property to someone else and misused the cheque. However, the stand was discarded by both the Courts below.

After going through the judgments of the Courts below, I am of the view that there are concurrent findings recorded by both the Courts below, supported by reasoning. There is no ground to interfere in same. Hence, revision is dismissed. Let revisionist be rearrested and committed to jail to undergo the remaining part of sentence.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

12.12.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No