



CRR-1751-2025

-1-

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

CRR-1751-2025

Date of Decision: 06.08.2025

Om Sai Traders and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Poonam Devi

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Gaurav Jaglan, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Present revision petition has been filed impugning the order dated 16.04.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram in CRA-68-2025, whereby, the petitioners were directed to deposit 20% of the compensation amount under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, 'the Act').

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that the petitioner firm through his proprietor was prosecuted in a complaint under Section 138 of the Act and he was convicted by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram under Section 138 of the Act, vide judgment dated 10.01.2025 and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for three months and was ordered to pay compensation to the tune of Rs.6,00,000/- to the complainant. It is further submitted that against the order dated 10.01.2025, the petitioner filed an appeal before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge at Gurugram and learned Appellate Court vide its impugned order dated 16.04.2025 suspended the sentence of petitioner subject to deposit of 20% of the compensation amount with the aid of Section 148 of the NI Act. However, due to financial constraints, the petitioner failed to comply with



the order dated 16.04.2025. He submits that even otherwise, the impugned order dated 16.04.2025 passed by the learned Appellate Court is in violation of the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jamboo Bhandari vs M.P.State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and others**, 2024(1) SCC (Cri) 90 wherein 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. It is submitted that learned trial Court has not appreciated the case and circumstances of the petitioner as per mandate of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jamboo Bhandari's** case (supra).

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the record, it is apparent that sentence of the petitioner was suspended by learned Appellate Court subject to deposit of 20% of the compensation amount awarded by learned trial Court. However, the petitioner did not comply with the same.

4. 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 firm through his proprietor is relegated to approach the learned Appellate Court concerned and file an appropriate application

before it, which would be decided, by taking into consideration the law laid down by the Hon’ble Apex Court in **Jamboo Bhandari’s** case (supra) in this regard within one month from the date of its filing. The direction given in the order dated 16.04.2025 by learned Appellate Court to the extent of depositing 20% of compensation, is set aside and the petitioner will continue to remain on bail as per order dated 16.04.2025 of learned Appellate Court till the above-said application is disposed of by it.

06.08.2025		(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
sharmila		JUDGE
	Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable :	Yes/No