

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRMP No. 1355 of 2019**

Raj Anand Chainani, S/o - Shri Parmanand Chainani, Aged about - 52 years, R/o - Behind Baba Kishanram Gurudwara, Lakhenagar, Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Ravi Kumar, S/o - Saraswati Lal Jaiswal, Aged about - 32 years R/o M/s Jaiswal Traders, Main Road, Santoshi Nagar, Tikrapara, Polic Station - Tikrapara, Tahsil and District - Raipur (C.G.)
2. Smt. Kalawati Jaiswal, W/o - Ravi Kumar, Aged about - 29 years R/o - M/s Jaiswal Traders, Main Road, Santoshi Nagar, Tikrapara, Polic Station - Tikrapara, Tahsil and District - Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For the petitioner	:	Mr. Dharendra Prasad Mishra, Advocate
For the respondent	:	None

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ram Prasanna Sharma**Order on Board****18.06.2019.**

1. Heard on I.A. No.01/2019, application for condonation of delay in filing the instant petition.
2. On due consideration, application is allowed and delay of 266 days is hereby condoned.
3. Also Heard on application under Section 378(4) of CrMP for grant of leave to appeal.
4. On due consideration, leave is granted.
5. This petition is preferred against the order dated 17^h March, 2018 passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Raipur (CG), in Complaint Case No. 139/2016 wherein the said Court acquitted the respondents for

the charge under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, "the Act") as the case was dismissed for want of prosecution.

6. It appears that on 17th April, 2018, the case was fixed for appearance of respondent and summons issued. It appears that process fee was paid but it is not clear from the record, whether the summons were issued or not or whether it is served or not or service report is awaited.

7. In the matter of **Associated Cement Co. Ltd. Vs. Keshvanand** reported in (1998) 1 SCC 687, Hon'ble the Apex Court held as under:-

"18. Reading the Section in its entirety would reveal that two constraints are imposed on the court for exercising the power under the Section. First is, if the court thinks that in a situation it is proper to adjourn the hearing then the Magistrate shall not acquit the accused. Second is, when the Magistrate considers that personal attendance of the complainant is not necessary on that day the Magistrate has the power to dispense with his attendance and proceed with the case. When the Court notices that the complainant is absent on a particular day the court must consider whether personal attendance of the complainant is essential on that day for progress of the case and also whether the situation does not justify the case being adjourned to another date due to any other reason. If the situation does not justify the case being adjourned the Court is free to dismiss the complaint and acquit the accused. But if the presence of the complainant on that day was quite unnecessary then resorting to the step of axing down the complaint may not be a proper exercise of the power envisaged in the section. The discretion must, therefore be exercised judicially and fairly without impairing the cause of administration of criminal justice."

Again, in the matter of **Mohd. Azeem Vs. A. Venkatesh & another** reported in (2002) 7 SCC 726, Hon'ble the Apex Court held that in a proceeding under the Act, 1881, the single default in appearance on the part of the complainant, the dismissal of the complaint case is not proper, legal and justified.

8. Dismissal of the complaint case was not the only option before the trial Court. The trial Court could have adjourned the case to some other

date as per the provisions of Section 256(1) CrPC. The court should have proceeded to decide the case on merits after providing opportunity to adduce evidence to both the sides and it should not have sent to record room without deciding issues between the parties but that is not done in the present case, therefore, the order passed by the trial Court is not sustainable. The trial Court should have made effort for appearance of the respondent and provide opportunity to petitioner for paying process fee for issuance of summons but that is not done.

9. Accordingly, order passed by the trial Court is set aside allowing the petition. The trial Court is directed to proceed with the case after providing opportunity to the petitioner to pay process fee for issuance of summons to the respondent. After issuance of summons the case be decided on merit.

10. Petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court on 30th July, 2019 for further proceedings.

Sd/-

(Ram Prasanna Sharma)
JUDGE