



\$~15 & 16

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

+ **CRL.L.P. 559/2022**

M/S SACHDEVA ENTERPRISESPetitioner

Through: Varun Mathur, Adv.
through V.C.

versus

THE STATE AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State.
Mr. Karun Suneja, Adv.
for R-2 through V.C

+ **CRL.L.P. 602/2022**

MS SACHDEVA ENTERPRISESPetitioner

Through: Varun Mathur, Adv.
through V.C.

versus

THE STATE AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State.
Mr. Karun Suneja, Adv.
for R-2 through V.C

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **28.07.2025**

CRL.M.A. 27413/2022 (delay of 55 days in filing the leave to appeal) in CRL.L.P. 602/2022

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 55 in filing the present appeal is condoned.

2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.L.P. 559/2022 & CRL.L.P. 602/2022

3. The present leave to appeals are filed under Section 378 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') against the **CRL.L.P. 559/2022 & CRL.L.P. 602/2022**

Page 1 of 3



judgments dated 28.07.2022, passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate ('MM'), Rouse Avenue Court Complex, New Delhi District, New Delhi, whereby Respondent No. 2 was acquitted of the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ('NI Act') in CC Nos. 57095/2016 and 44738/2016 respectively.

4. 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.

5. 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.

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

7. 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

CRL.L.P. 559/2022 & CRL.L.P. 602/2022 **Page 2 of 3**



Sessions. If the petition is allowed to continue before this Court, the parties will stand to lose a forum of challenge.

8. In view of the above, the present matters are disposed of with direction that the present petition be treated as an appeal under the proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC and numbered accordingly.

9. The Registry is directed to transfer the entire record of the case to the concerned appellate Court of Sessions.

10. The order be communicated to the concerned Principal District & Sessions Judge for compliance and listing before the concerned Appellate Court on 03.09.2025.

11. The parties are directed to appear before the concerned Appellate Court on 03.09.2025.

12. 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.

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

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 28, 2025

“SK”