

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

**231 (2)**

**CRR-1466-2019 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 11.05.2022**

PARMESHWAR KUMAR DIXIT

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present:- Mr. P.S. Hundal, Senior Advocate  
Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Advocate  
for the Petitioner.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aalok Jagga, Advocate and  
Mr. Harkirat S. Jagdev, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

The present criminal revision petition has been preferred against the judgment and order dated 26.02.2015 passed by this Court of Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Ludhiana vide which the petitioner was convicted for offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and had been ordered to be sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 18 months along with a fine of Rs. 4,000/- as well as the subsequent judgment dated 29.05.2019 passed in Criminal Appeal No.25 dated 11.03.2015 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana wherein the appeal was dismissed and the judgment and order passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class were affirmed.

2. A perusal of the order dated 04.03.2021, passed by this

Court shows that the counsel for the petitioner had made a statement that he would not address arguments on merits and the conviction of petitioner for commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 but would restrict his argument only to the extent of the punishment awarded in all the three cases and that as per Section 427 Cr.P.C., the sentence be ordered to run concurrently, being a part of the same transaction.

3. Today on resumed hearing, a custody certificate has been filed by the learned State counsel. A copy thereof has been furnished to the counsel for the petitioner. It is evident from perusal of the said custody certificate that the petitioner has already undergone the complete sentence in the aforesaid revision petition and has been detained now in custody to serve his substantive sentence in Criminal Appeal No. 26 dated 11.03.2015.

4. In view of the fact that the revision petition was limited only to the extent of the sentence and that the petitioner has already undergone the complete sentence in the instant case, the said revision has been rendered infructuous.

Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**MAY 11, 2022**

*Vishal sharma*

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |