



\$~25 to 27

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

+ **CRL.L.P. 315/2022**

M/S GIVO PRIVATE LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Aman, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Goyal, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

SH. RAJESH ROHILLARespondent
Through: Mr. Kenet Paul, Adv.
(through VC)

+ **CRL.L.P. 316/2022**

M/S GIVO PRIVATE LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Aman, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Goyal, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

SH. RAJESH ROHILLA & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Kenet Paul, Adv.
(through VC)

+ **CRL.L.P. 317/2022**

M/S GIVO PRIVATE LTD.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Aman, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Goyal, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

SH. RAJESH ROHILLARespondent
Through: Mr. Kenet Paul, Adv.
(through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

04.08.2025



1. The present leave to appeals are filed under Section 378 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') against the judgments dated 16.01.2020, passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate ('MM')-04, N.I.Act, South-East District, Saket District Courts, Delhi, whereby the respondent was acquitted of the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ('NI Act') in CT No. 9849/2018, CT No. 9850/2018 and CT No. 9848/2018 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 appeals against the judgments of acquittal and is not required to seek leave to appeals. 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 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 appeals under the proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC and numbered accordingly.

7. The Registry is directed to transfer entire record of the cases, including the requisitioned copy of TCRs, to the concerned appellate Court of Sessions.

8. The order be communicated to the learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, South-East District, Saket District Courts, Delhi for compliance and listing before the concerned Appellate Court on 08.09.2025.

9. The parties are directed to appear before the concerned Appellate Court on 08.09.2025.

10. Considering that the matters have been pending before this Court since the year 2022, the learned Sessions Court is requested to dispose of the matters expeditiously.

11. A copy of this order be placed in all the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 4, 2025

'KDK'