



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

**CRR-255-2025 (O&M)**  
**Date of Decision:05.03.2025**

Jora Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

Manish Kumar

...Respondent

**Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

Present: Ms. Manu Loona, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate  
for the respondent.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

**CRM-9003-2025**

1. Application is allowed as prayed for, subject to just all exceptions.
2. Annexure R-1 is taken on record.

**CRR-255-2025 (O&M)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present revision petition against the impugned judgment dated 11.09.2024 passed by the Court of Sessions Judge, Fazilka and the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 22.12.2023 passed by the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Fazilka, whereby, the present petitioner has been convicted under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") and was sentenced to undergo Simple Imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay the compensation amount to the tune of Rs.1,70,000/- to the complainant.

2. Along with the main petition, the petitioner had filed an application under Section 147 of the “Act” read with Section 528 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to compound the offence under Section 138 of the “Act”.

3. As per the case set up by the petitioner, after the impugned judgment was passed by the Court of Sessions Judge, Fazilka, the parties had entered into a compromise and the entire amount was paid to the respondent by the present petitioner. He further contends that the parties may be allowed to compound the offences in the present case.

4. A short reply has been filed on behalf of respondent and the same is taken on record.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent submits that he has received the due amount of debt and has effected a compromise with the petitioner, with the intervention of the respectables. Even he admits that the compromise deed dated 08.01.2025 (Annexure P-1) was executed between the parties and he has no objection, in case, the present application for compounding is allowed and the petitioner is acquitted on the basis of compromise.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has held in the matter of **Damodar S. Prabhu Vs. Sayed Babalal H., AIR 2010 (SC) 1907: 2010(2) RCR (Criminal 851)** as follows:-

*15. With regard to the progression of litigation in cheque bouncing cases, the learned Attorney General has urged this Court to frame guidelines for a graded scheme of imposing costs on parties who unduly delay compounding of the offence. It*

*was submitted that the requirement of deposit of the costs will act as a deterrent for delayed composition, since at present, free and easy compounding of offences at any stage, however belated, gives an incentive to the drawer of the cheque to delay settling the cases for years. An application for compounding made after several years not only results in the system being burdened but the complainant is also deprived of effective justice. In view of this submission, we direct that the following guidelines be followed:-*

THE GUIDELINES

*(i) In the circumstances, it is proposed as follows:*

*(a) That directions can be given that the Writ of Summons be suitably modified making it clear to the accused that he could make an application for compounding of the offences at the first or second hearing of the case and that if such an application is made, compounding may be allowed by the court without imposing any costs on the accused.*

*(b) If the accused does not make an application for compounding as aforesaid, then if an application for compounding is made before the Magistrate at a subsequent stage, compounding can be allowed subject to the condition that the accused will be required to pay 10% of the cheque amount to be deposited as a condition for compounding with the Legal Services Authority, or such authority as the Court deems fit.*

*(c) Similarly, if the application for compounding is made before the Sessions Court or a High Court in revision or appeal, such compounding may be allowed on the condition that the accused pays 15% of the cheque amount by way of costs.*

*(d) Finally, if the application for compounding is made before the Supreme Court, the figure would increase to 20% of the cheque amount.*

*Let it also be clarified that any costs imposed in accordance with these guidelines should be deposited with the Legal Services Authority operating at the level of the Court before which compounding takes place. For instance, in case of compounding during the pendency of proceedings before a Magistrate's Court or a Court of Sessions, such costs should be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority. Likewise, costs imposed in connection with composition before the High Court should be deposited with the State Legal Services Authority and those imposed in connection with composition before the Supreme Court should be deposited with the National Legal Services Authority.*

16. We are also in agreement with the Learned Attorney General's suggestions for controlling the filing of multiple complaints that are relatable to the same transaction. It was submitted that complaints are being increasingly filed in multiple jurisdictions in a vexatious manner which causes tremendous harassment and prejudice to the drawers of the cheque. For instance, in the same transaction pertaining to a loan taken on an installment basis to be repaid in equated monthly installments, several cheques are taken which are dated for each monthly installment and upon the dishonor of each of such cheques, different complaints are being filed in different courts which may also have jurisdiction in relation to the complaint. In light of this submission, we direct that it should be mandatory for the complainant to disclose that no other complaint has been filed in any other court in respect of the same transaction. Such a disclosure should be made on a sworn affidavit which should accompany the complaint filed under Section 200 of the CrPC. If it is found that such multiple complaints have been filed, orders for transfer of the complaint to the first court should be given, generally speaking, by the High Court after imposing heavy costs

*on the complainant for resorting to such a practice. These directions should be given effect prospectively.*

*17. We are also conscious of the view that the judicial endorsement of the above quoted guidelines could be seen as an act of judicial law-making and therefore an intrusion into the legislative domain. It must be kept in mind that Section 147 of the Act does not carry any guidance on how to proceed with the compounding of offences under the Act. We have already explained that the scheme contemplated under Section 320 of the CrPC cannot be followed in the strict sense. In view of the legislative vacuum, we see no hurdle to the endorsement of some suggestions which have been designed to discourage litigants from unduly delaying the composition of the offence in cases involving Section 138 of the Act. The graded scheme for imposing costs is a means to encourage compounding at an early stage of litigation. In the status quo, valuable time of the Court is spent on the trial of these cases and the parties are not liable to pay any Court fee since the proceedings are governed by the Code of Criminal Procedure, even though the impact of the offence is largely confined to the private parties. Even though the imposition of costs by the competent court is a matter of discretion, the scale of costs has been suggested in the interest of uniformity. The competent Court can of course reduce the costs with regard to the specific facts and circumstances of a case, while recording reasons in writing for such variance. Bona fide litigants should of course contest the proceedings to their logical end. Even in the past, this Court has used its power to do complete justice under Article 142 of the Constitution to frame guidelines in relation to subject-matter where there was a legislative vacuum.*

8. It is not in dispute that the respondent had initiated criminal prosecution of the petitioner on the ground of dishonour of cheque. However,

now, it is apparent from the compromise deed (Annexure P-1) that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties and even the learned counsel for the respondent has made a statement that he has no objection if the petitioner is ordered to be acquitted by this Court. Consequently, by invoking the powers of this Court under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act read with Section 528 of B.N.S.S, the parties are allowed to compound the offences and the petitioner is ordered to be acquitted of notice of accusation.

9. As a consequence, the impugned judgment dated 11.09.2024 passed by the Court of Sessions Judge, Fazilka and the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 22.12.2023 passed by the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Fazilka are ordered to be set aside.

10. The petitioner is also directed to deposit an amount of Rs.25,500/- which is 15% of the cheque amount, within a period of two months from today with the Punjab Legal Services Authority. In case the cost is not deposited with the Punjab State Legal Service Authority within a period of two months from today, the present petition shall be deemed to be dismissed.

11. All other pending applications if any, are also disposed off, accordingly.

**(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

05.03.2025  
*hitesh*

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