



\$~22 to 30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.L.P. 136/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)
versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

23

+ **CRL.L.P. 152/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)
versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

24

+ **CRL.L.P. 160/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)
versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

25



+ **CRL.L.P. 195/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

26

+ **CRL.L.P. 293/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

27

+ **CRL.L.P. 463/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

28

+ **CRL.L.P. 464/2022 & CRL.M.A. 19511/2022**



SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

29

+

CRL.L.P. 466/2022 & CRL.M.A. 19545/2022
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

30

+

**CRL.L.P. 467/2022, CRL.M.A. 19613/2022 &
CRL.M.A. 19704/2022**
SH. KANCHHID LALPetitioner
Through: Ms. Anita Dhingra, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State
Mr. Bharat Ahuja, Adv.
(through VC)

CORAM:



HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

13.08.2025

1. The present leave to appeals are filed under Section 378 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') against the judgements dated 10.12.2021, passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate ('MM'), Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, whereby the accused respondents were acquitted of the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ('NI Act') in Complaint Case Nos. 2671/2020, 2666/2020, 2665/2020, 2670/2020, 2864/2020, 2867/2020, 2866/2020 and 2862/2020 respectively.

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 petitions be transferred to the learned Court of Sessions to be treated as appeals.

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 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, thus is entitled to maintain appeals under Section 372 of the CrPC against the judgments of acquittal.

5. In terms of proviso to Section 372, 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 appeals under proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC and numbered accordingly.

7. It is important to note that the impugned order in CRL.L.P. 464/2022 and CRL.L.P. 467/2022 is the same, however, the annexed complaints in the said matters are different. It appears that the petitioner has inadvertently annexed the wrong judgment of acquittal in one of these matters. As the matters are being transferred, this Court does not consider it apposite to address the said issue at this stage. The petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate steps to clarify the said issue before the learned Court of Sessions.

8. The Registry is directed to transfer entire record of the cases, including the requisitioned copies of Trial Court Records, to the concerned Appellate Court.

9. The order be communicated to the learned Principal District & Sessions Judge for compliance and listing before the concerned Appellate Court on 22.09.2025.



10. The parties are directed to appear before the learned Appellate Court on 22.09.2025.
11. Considering that the matters have been pending before this Court since the year 2022, the learned Sessions Courts is requested to dispose of the matter expeditiously.
12. A copy of this order be placed in all the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 13, 2025/“SS”