



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-AS-297-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.11.2025

Sajjan Kumar

.....Appellant

Versus

Unicel Corporation and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Ashok Tyagi, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rajesh Arora, Advocate for the respondents.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J.(Oral)

The present appeal has been preferred under Section 378(4) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter 'Cr.P.C.') against the judgment of acquittal dated 22.01.2016 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gurgaon in a complaint case filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter 'NI Act').

2. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M/s Celestium Financial vs. A. Gnanasekaran Etc., 2025(3) RCR (Criminal) 208*, after considerable discussion and comparative interpretation of Sections 372 and 378(4) of Cr.P.C., concluded that the victim has a right to file an appeal under Section 372 of Cr.P.C. before the Court of Sessions. Reliance in this regard can also be placed on *Satish Kumar Versus Jugal Kishor* in *CRM-A-2700-MA-2018* decided on 02.07.2025. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Directorate of Revenue Intelligence Vs. Raj Kumar Arora* in *SCC Online 819* has clarified that as a rule of thumb, judgments rendered shall be applicable retrospectively.



3. Therefore, in view of the judgment rendered by the Apex Court in ***Celestium Financial*** (*supra*),the present appeal is remanded back to the learned Sessions Judge concerned with a direction to treat the same as filed under Section 372 of the Cr.P.C. and to dispose of by himself/herself or entrust it to appropriate Court for its disposal.
4. The Registry is directed to send the complete paper-book and the record of the case to the learned Sessions Judge concerned forthwith.
5. Disposed of accordingly.

03.11.2025
Harish Kumar

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No