

2025:PHHC:103201



S. No.116

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

**CRM-M-43025 of 2025
Date of Decision:11.08.2025**

**Ravinder Singh
Vs.
Jagdev Singh**

**.....Petitioner

.....Respondent**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present:- Mr. Ashish Soi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 has been filed for quashing of order dated 17.04.2025 (Annexure P-10) passed by Court of learned Sessions Judge, Ludhiana in criminal appeal bearing CRA No.419 of 2025 titled '*Ravinder Singh vs. Jagdev Singh*' filed against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 27.03.2025 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana in case bearing COMA No.28136 of 2019, whereby, sentence of the petitioner was suspended conditionally by imposing a condition to deposit 20% of the compensation amount within a period of one month.

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 with the submissions that the complainant deals in the sale and purchase of cement on wholesale basis and the petitioner also used to purchase the



same on credit basis. Thereafter, in discharge of his liability, he issued cheque bearing No.126865 dated 03.09.2019 of Rs.10,00,000/- drawn on Central Bank of India, Brown Road, Ludhiana in favour of the complainant with the assurance that the cheque will be encashed upon its presentation. However, upon presentation, the said cheque was dishonoured with the remarks “Funds Insufficient” vide bank memo dated 04.09.2019. Thereafter, the complainant issued legal notice dated 12.09.2019 to the petitioner/accused, but he failed to pay the aforementioned amount and the complaint was instituted.

3. Vide judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence dated 27.03.2025 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of two years for commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act and was further directed to pay compensation, equivalent to the cheque amount i.e. Rs.10,00,000/- to the complainant, along with default mechanism. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred an appeal against the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence before the learned Sessions Judge, Ludhiana. The learned Appellate Court vide order dated 17.04.2025, suspended the sentence of the petitioner subject to depositing of 20% of the compensation amount.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned Appellate Court failed to appreciate the facts in the right perspective and imposed the condition to deposit 20% of the compensation amount and such a condition is



illegal, arbitrary and in violation of the law 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 in which it has been held as under:-

“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 a petitioner who has been convicted for offence under Section 138 of a 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 conclusion must be recorded.”



5. In view of the law laid down in *Jamboo Bhandari (supra)*, the Appellate Court was required to consider whether the present case falls within the exception or not but no such reasons have been recorded. The impugned order dated 17.04.2025 (Annexure P-10) is thus not sustainable and hereby set aside to the extent of imposing the condition of depositing 20% of compensation amount. The learned 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 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.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

August 11, 2025
renu

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No