



133

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

**CRM-M No.37081 of 2025
Date of Decision : 23.07.2025**

Vinod Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Madan Lal

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for quashing of conditional order imposed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, dated 10.12.2024 (Annexure P-2) in CRA No.361 of 2024 titled as “Vinod Kumar vs. State of Haryana etc.” arising out of complaint bearing NACT No.567 of 2017 titled as ‘Madan Lal vs. Vinod Kumar’, as the said condition is totally illegal, unjust and against the statutory rights of petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was prosecuted in a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. He has further submitted that the petitioner was convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Fatehabad vide judgment dated 13.11.2024 and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 08 months and was ordered to pay compensation to the



tune of Rs.4,00,000/-, i.e. equal to amount of cheque. It is further submitted that the petitioner assailed the order dated 13.11.2024 by way of filing an appeal before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, which is admitted. Though the application for suspension of sentence of the petitioner was allowed, however, the learned Appellate Court vide impugned order dated 10.12.2024, ordered the petitioner to deposit 20% of the compensation amount. He has submitted that the impugned order has been passed without giving any opportunity to the petitioner to submit response to the same. He has further submitted that the impugned order directing the petitioner to deposit 20% of the compensation amount is unsustainable in the eyes of law as per the provisions of Section 148 of Negotiable Instruments Act and the same has been passed in violation of the law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jamboo Bhandari vs M.P.State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and others, 2024(1) SCC (Cri) 90***. He prays that the petitioner be granted one opportunity to present his case before the Appellate Court and then pass fresh order after considering his contentions as well as the mandate of Hon'ble Supreme Court. He has further stated that in the ***Jamboo Bhandari case (supra)***, it has been held that when Appellate Court considers the prayer under Section 389 of the Cr.P.C. of an accused who has been convicted for offence under Section 138 of the NI 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 conclusion



must be recorded, which is missing in the present case.

3. Heard.
4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the record, it is apparent that the learned Appellate Court suspended the sentence of the petitioner and ordered to deposit 20% of the compensation amount vide order dated 10.12.2024. The order has been passed without affording any opportunity to the petitioner to explain his position and as such, the same is against the mandate of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jamboo Bhandari's case (supra)*.
5. In view of the aforesaid facts, and the judicial precedent settled by Hon'ble Apex Court in *Jamboo Bhandari's case (supra)*, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of. Petitioner is relegated to approach the learned Appellate Court concerned and file an appropriate application before it, which would be decided by passing a fresh order, by taking into consideration the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Jamboo Bhandari's case (supra)* in this regard within two weeks from the date of filing of the application. The direction given in the order dated 10.12.2024 by the learned Appellate Court to the extent of depositing 20% of the compensation amount is hereby set aside, however, the petitioner shall continue to remain on bail as per order dated 10.12.2024 of the learned Appellate Court till the above said application is disposed of by it.

23.07.2025

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:
:

Yes/No
Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE