



\$~11

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

+ CRL.REV.P. 618/2022

AMARVEER SINGH RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikram Singh, Adv.

versus

THE STATE AND ANR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

**19.12.2025**

%

1. This revision petition under Section 397 read with Section 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973<sup>1</sup> is directed against order 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2018, passed by Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-03, Dwarka Courts, New Delhi in CA No. 67/17, titled “*Amarveer Singh v. Suresh Chand & Anr.*”

2. Pursuant to trial in the complaint filed by Respondent No. 2, the Petitioner was convicted for the offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881<sup>2</sup> by judgement of conviction dated 8<sup>th</sup> August, 2017. By order on sentence dated 26<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, he was sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 6 months and pay a fine of ₹15,00,000/- to Respondent No. 2 as compensation. In default of payment of compensation, the Petitioner was directed to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of 3 months.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Cr.P.C.”

<sup>2</sup> “NI Act”



3. The appeal against the aforesaid judgement of conviction and order on sentence was dismissed by the impugned judgement dated 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2018.
4. Aggrieved thereby, the Petitioner filed the present revision petition. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties amicably settled their dispute, as evidenced by a Settlement Agreement dated 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2022, copy whereof has been annexed with the petition. Taking note of the settlement and the fact that the offence under Section 138 of the NI Act is compoundable, this Court, by order dated 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2022, suspended the sentence of the Petitioner.
5. Thereafter, by order dated 1<sup>st</sup> July, 2025, the Petitioner was directed to deposit 15% of the cheque amount as a pre-condition for compounding, in terms of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Damodar S. Prabhu vs Sayed Babalal H.***<sup>3</sup> The Petitioner has since complied with the said direction and deposited the requisite amount with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority, and challans to this effect have been placed on record.
6. The legal position on the issue of compounding of offences under 138 of NI Act is now well-settled. Section 147 of the NI Act makes offences under Section 138 compoundable, notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in Cr.P.C. The Supreme Court has consistently held that such compounding can be permitted at any stage of the proceedings, including after conviction.<sup>4</sup> The continuation of criminal proceedings after the grievance of the complainant has been addressed would serve no meaningful purpose.

---

<sup>3</sup> (2010) 5 SCC 663.

<sup>4</sup> Damodar S. Prabhu v. Sayed Babalal H. (2010) 5 SCC 663; K.M. Ibrahim v. K.P. Mohammed (2010) 1 SCC 798; O.P. Dholakia v. State of Haryana (2000) 1 SCC 762.



7. Having regard to the aforesaid legal principles and considering the settlement between the parties, the fact that the entire amount due under the impugned cheques stands paid, and that 15% of the cheque amount has been deposited with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the criminal proceedings. Accordingly, the conviction of the Petitioner under Section 138 of the NI Act is set aside on account of compounding of the offence.

8. The petition is disposed of.

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**DECEMBER 19, 2025/ng**