



\$~10

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

+ CRL.L.P. 357/2025, CRL.M.A. 19569/2025 & CRL.M.A. 19570/2025

HARPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bharat Bagga, Advocate

versus

MUZAMMIL

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

04.08.2025

%

1. The Appellant, who is also the Complainant, has filed the instant leave to appeal under Section 419 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (corresponding to Sections 378 (4) of the Code of Criminal Procedure²) assailing the judgment of acquittal dated 28th November, 2024, passed by the JMFC, (NI Act), Dwarka Court, Delhi in C.C. No. 9720/2023 titled as ***“Harpreet Singh Vs Muzammil”***, pertaining to an offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881³.

2. In a recent judgement of ***Celestium Financial v. A. Gnanasekaran Etc.***⁴, the Supreme Court has held that in cases involving an offence under Section 138 of the NI Act, the complainant qualifies as a “victim” as defined under Section 2(wa) of Cr.P.C. Therefore, the Complainant may proceed under the proviso to Section 372 of Cr.P.C and need not invoke Section

¹ “BNSS”

² “CrPC”

³ “NI Act”

⁴ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1320.



378(4) of Cr.P.C.

3. In light of the afore-noted judgment, counsel for the Appellant seeks leave to withdraw the present petition, with liberty to file an appeal under the proviso to Section 372 of Cr.P.C.

4. Considering the above, the following directions are issued:

4.1. Leave and liberty granted. The Appellant is permitted to file an appeal under the proviso to Section 372 of Cr.P.C against the judgment of acquittal dated 28th November, 2024, in light of the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Celestium Financial***.

4.2. Although there has been a delay in filing the present petition, however, considering the fact that the legal position has been elucidated by the Supreme Court only recently, it is directed that the time period from the date of initial filing of the present leave to appeal with the Registry of this Court, till the expiry of one week from today, shall be excluded for the purpose of computing the period of delay. The Appellant shall be at liberty to pursue the remedy as noted above and may file an application for condonation of delay, if any, which shall then be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law.

5. In view of the above, the present appeal is disposed of along with the pending application.

6. It is made clear that the Court has not commented on the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 4, 2025/ab