



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

CRM-M-13872-2025 (O & M)

Date of decision: 12.03.2025

RAMESH KUMAR

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate and
 Ms. Monika Tanwar, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition under Section 528 BNSS has been filed for setting aside of order dated 05.02.2025 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind in an appeal CRA-32 of 2025 titled as '*Ramesh Kumar vs. Vikas and another*' filed against the judgment dated 14.01.2025 passed by learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Narwala in NACT-88 of 2020, whereby, the sentence of the petitioner was suspended conditionally by imposing a condition to deposit 20% of the cheque amount as compensation within 60 days.

2. The present complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter to be referred as N.I. Act) has been initiated by the complainant-firm with the submissions that petitioner purchased seeds and pesticides on credit basis through various bills from it, so outstanding against petitioner became Rs.16,69,847/- up to 19.05.2018. Out of which, the petitioner paid an amount of Rs.6,95,465.60/- and the amount which was remaining due towards him was Rs.9,74,381.40/-. For clearance of outstanding



amount, the petitioner issued cheque of Rs.9,74,000/- bearing No.027848 dated 31.01.2020 drawn on UBI Bank Branch, Uchana and asked the complainant firm to deposit the cheque after 10 days. Upon presentation, the said cheque was dishonoured vide memo dated 15.06.2019 with remarks "Funds Insufficient". Thereafter, the complainant got issued legal notice dated 27.02.2020 to the petitioner/accused, but he failed to pay the aforementioned amount. Hence, this complaint.

3. Vide judgment and order dated 14.01.2025 passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Narwana, the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 01 year for commission of offence punishable under Section 143(1)(proviso) of Negotiable Instruments Act and was further directed to pay compensation to the tune of cheque amount i.e. Rs.12,00,000/- within a period of two months from passing of judgment and it was also directed that fine, if any already paid to the complainant, be set off from the amount of compensation. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred an appeal against the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind. The learned Appellate Court vide order dated 05.02.2025, suspended the sentence of the petitioner subject to depositing 20% of the compensation amount within 60 days of passing of the order.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned lower Appellate Court failed to appreciate the facts in the right perspective and imposed the condition to deposit 20% of the compensation and such a condition is illegal, arbitrary and in violation of the law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Criminal Appeal Nos.2741 of 2023**



(@ SLP(Crl.) Nos. 4927 of 2023 ***Jamboo Bhandari vs. M.P. State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and others***, decided on 04.09.2023. Speaking through Justice Abhay S. Oka, it has been held as follows:-

“6. What is held by this Court is that a purposive interpretation should be made of Section 148 of the N.I. Act. Hence, normally, Appellate Court will be justified in imposing the condition of deposit as provided in Section 148. However, in a case where the Appellate Court is satisfied that the condition of deposit of 20% will be unjust or imposing such a condition will amount to deprivation of the right of appeal of the appellant, exception can be made for the reasons specifically recorded.

7. Therefore, when Appellate Court considers the prayer under Section 389 of the Cr.P.C. of an petitioner who has been convicted for offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act, it is always open for the Appellate Court to consider whether it is an exceptional case which warrants grant of suspension of sentence without imposing the condition of deposit of 20% of the fine/compensation amount. As stated earlier, if the Appellate Court comes to the conclusion that it is an exceptional case, the reasons for coming to the said 4 conclusion must be recorded.”

5. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the judgment passed in ***Jamboo Bhandari (supra)***, the lower Appellate Court was required to consider whether the present case falls in the exception or not. The impugned order dated 05.02.2025, whereby, the condition of depositing 20% of compensation amount has been imposed for granting suspension of sentence upon the petitioner is hereby set aside. The learned lower Appellate Court is directed to re-examine the case after granting an opportunity to the petitioner to make submissions regarding the exceptional circumstances and



decide whether it is an appropriate case that warrants waiver of the requirement of deposit of 20% of the compensation awarded by learned trial Court.

6. The matter is remanded back to the learned lower Appellate Court with a direction to decide the matter afresh in accordance with law in the light of judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jamboo Bhandari's case (supra)***.

7. The petition is disposed of accordingly.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

March 12, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No