



\$~25 to 27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.L.P. 390/2022
THOMAS COOK INDIA LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Aman Leekha,
Advocate (through VC).

versus

M/S TAURUS GLOBAL TRAVEL MANAGEMENT
SERVICES PVT. LTD. & ORS.Respondents
Through: None.

+ CRL.L.P. 394/2022
THOMAS COOK (I) LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Aman Leekha,
Advocate (through VC).

versus

M/S TAURUS GLOBAL TRAVEL MANAGEMENT
SERVICES PVT. LTD. & ORS.Respondent
Through: None.

+ CRL.L.P. 395/2022
THOMAS COOK (I) LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Aman Leekha,
Advocate (through VC).

versus

M/S TAURUS GLOBAL TRAVEL MANAGEMENT
SERVICES PVT. LTD. & ORS.Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **21.07.2025**

1. The present leave to appeals are filed under Section 378 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') against the judgments dated 11.05.2022, passed by the learned Metropolitan



Magistrate ('MM'), New Delhi District, Rouse Avenue Court Complex whereby the respondents were acquitted of the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ('NI Act') in CC Nos. 40834/2016, 40835/2016 and 40832/2016.

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Celestium Financial v. A. Gnanasekaran* : 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1320**, the petitioner being a victim is entitled to file an appeal against the judgment of acquittal and is not required to seek leave to appeal. He submits that the present petition be transferred to the learned Court of Sessions to be treated as an appeal.

3. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the recent decision in ***Celestium Financial v. A. Gnanasekaran* (supra)** has opined that a complainant who prefers a complaint under Section 138 of the NI Act is an aggrieved party who suffers economic loss due to the dishonour of cheque, and such a complainant qualifies as a victim within the meaning of Section 2(wa) of the CrPC. Consequently, it was held that such a complainant is entitled to the benefit of the proviso of Section 372 of the CrPC, enabling them to maintain an appeal against an order of acquittal without seeking leave to appeal under Section 378(4) of the CrPC.

4. The petitioner was the complainant in the complaints preferred under Section 138 of the NI Act, and is thus entitled to maintain appeals under Section 372 of the CrPC.

5. In terms of the proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC, an appeal by a victim against the judgment of acquittal passed by the learned MM will have to be heard by the learned Court of Sessions. If the petitions are allowed to continue before this Court, the parties will stand to lose a forum of challenge.



6. In view of the above, the present matters are disposed of with direction that the present petitions be treated as an appeal under the proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC and numbered accordingly.
7. The Registry is directed to transfer entire record of the case to the concerned appellate Court of Sessions.
8. The order be communicated to the concerned Principal District & Sessions Judge for compliance and listing before the concerned Appellate Court on 02.09.2025.
9. The parties are directed to appear before the concerned Appellate Court on 02.09.2025.
10. Considering that the matter has been pending before this Court since the year 2022, the learned Sessions Court is requested to dispose of the matter expeditiously.
11. A copy of the order be placed in all the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 21, 2025

DU