IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr. Appeal No. 17 of 2014
Reserved on: 05.11.2026
Date of Decision: 19.11.2026.

Baldev Singh ...Appellant

Versus

Som Raj ...Respondent

Coram

Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1] *No*

For the Petitioner : Mr Karan Singh Kanwar, Senior Advocate with Ms. Bhagya Rani, Advocate.

For the Respondent : M/s Vipin Pandit and Anirudh Sharma, Advocates.

Rakesh Kainthla, Judge

The present appeal is directed against the judgment dated 20.03.2013 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Rajgarh, District Sirmaur (learned Trial Court) vide which the respondent (accused before the learned Trial Court) was acquitted of the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (NI Act). *(The*

[1] Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.

parties shall hereinafter be referred to in the same manner as they were arrayed before the learned Trial Court for convenience).

2. Briefly stated, the facts giving rise to the present appeal are that the complainant filed a complaint before the learned Trial Court against the accused for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act. It was asserted that the complainant and the accused knew each other for many years. The accused was in need of money, and he requested the complainant to arrange ₹3,50,000/- as a loan. The complainant arranged the money and paid ₹3,50,000/- to the accused in the second week of October, 2010, in the presence of Pratap Singh. The accused issued a post-dated cheque to repay the amount. The complainant deposited the cheque in his account, but it was dishonoured with an endorsement "payment stopped by the drawer" and "insufficient funds". The complainant issued a legal notice to the accused, asking him to repay the money within 15 days from the date of receipt of the notice. The accused sent a reply to the notice but failed to repay the money. Hence, a complaint was filed before the learned Trial Court for taking action as per the law.

3. The learned Trial Court found sufficient reasons to summon the accused. When the accused appeared, a notice of accusation was put to him for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

4. The complainant examined Shitanshu Varmani (CW1), himself (CW2) and Pratap Singh (CW3).

5. The accused, in his statement recorded under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), denied the complainant's case in its entirety. He claimed that he knew the complainant from the date of filing of the complaint. He admitted that he had received a notice and sent a reply to it. He said that his cheque book had been lost and the complainant had misused his cheque. He examined Sandeep (DW1), Sithanshu Vermani (DW2) and Sandeep (DW3).

6. The learned Trial Court held that as per the complaint, the money was advanced in the 2nd week of October, 2010. The complainant asserted in his affidavit that the money was advanced in the second week of October, 2011. Therefore, there is a discrepancy regarding the date of advancing the

money. The complainant claimed that he had got the money by selling his vegetables at Chandigarh, and the bills produced by him do not show that he had ₹3,50,000/- with him. The witness Pratap Singh claimed that he knew the complainant for 1½ years. His statement was recorded on 03.09.2012, and as per his version, he would have known the complainant since March 2011. Therefore, he could not have been a witness to the advancement of the loan. The evidence led by the complainant was not sufficient to prove that he had advanced the loan to the complainant and the accused had issued the cheque to repay the amount. The version of the accused regarding the loss of the cheque was made probable by the defence evidence. Therefore, the learned Trial Court acquitted the accused.

7. Being aggrieved by the judgment passed by the learned Trial Court, the complainant has filed the present complaint asserting that the learned Trial Court failed to appreciate the evidence on record. The defence taken by the accused was false. The accused had deliberately written to the bank to stop the payment to bolster his defence. The learned Trial Court erred in acquitting the accused. Therefore, it was

prayed that the present appeal be allowed and the judgment passed by the learned Trial Court be set aside.

8. I have heard Mr Karan Singh Kanwar, learned Senior Advocate, assisted by Ms Bhagya Rani, learned counsel for the appellant/complainant and M/s Vipin Pandit and Anirudh Sharma, learned counsel for the respondent.

9. Mr Karan Singh Kanwar, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant/complainant, submitted that the affidavit contains a clerical error, which is apparent from the fact that the post-dated cheque dated 16.08.2011 was stated to have been issued, which was not possible had the loan been advanced in the second week of October, 2011. The complainant is not required to prove the financial capacity unless it is challenged by the accused in the reply to the notice sent by him. In the present case, the accused never challenged the complainant's financial capacity to advance the money in the reply. The statement of Partap Singh was wrongly discarded because a person does not give the precise dates but only an estimate, which may or may not be correct. Learned Trial Court had taken a view that could not have been taken by a reasonable person; therefore, he prayed that the

present appeal be allowed and the judgment passed by the learned Trial Court be set aside.

10. Mr Vipin Pandit, learned counsel for the respondent/accused, submitted that the complainant had himself stated in his affidavit repeatedly that the loan was advanced in the second week of October, 2011, and it is impermissible for him to submit before the Court that the loan was advanced in the second week of October 2010 and there is a clerical error in the affidavit. The learned Trial Court had taken a reasonable view which should not be set aside simply because another view is possible. There is no perversity in the judgment of the learned Trial Court. Hence, he prayed that the present appeal be dismissed.

11. I have given considerable thought to the submissions made at the bar and have gone through the records carefully.

12. The present appeal has been filed against a judgment of acquittal. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sanjay Kumar v. State of Bihar, 2026 SCC OnLine SC 1373,*** that the Court can interfere with a judgment of acquittal only if it is

impossible, perverse, wholly unsustainable, or manifestly illegal.

It was observed:

> **Scope of interference with an acquittal:**
>
> **26.** At the outset, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the settled principles governing interference with an order of acquittal. An accused is presumed innocent until proven guilty. When a court of competent jurisdiction acquits the accused, the presumption of innocence is not weakened but reinforced. Where such acquittal is affirmed by the High Court, the caution to be exercised by this Court under Article 136 is even greater.
>
> **27.** In ***Kali Ram v. State of Himachal Pradesh (1973) 2 SCC 808: 1973 SCC (Cri) 1048***, this Court explained the golden thread running through criminal jurisprudence in the following words:
>
> > *"25. Another golden thread which runs through the web of the administration of justice in criminal cases is that if two views are possible on the evidence adduced in the case, one pointing to the guilt of the accused and the other to his innocence, the view which is favourable to the accused should be adopted. This principle has a special relevance in cases wherein the guilt of the accused is sought to be established by circumstantial evidence. A rule has accordingly been laid down that unless the evidence adduced in the case is consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused and is inconsistent with that of his innocence, the Court should refrain from recording a finding of guilt of the accused. It is also an accepted rule that in case the Court entertains reasonable doubt regarding the guilt of the accused, the accused must have the benefit of that doubt. Of course, the doubt regarding the guilt of the accused should be reasonable; it is not the doubt of a mind which is either so vacillating that it is incapable of reaching a firm conclusion or so timid that it is hesitant and afraid to take things to their natural consequences. The rule regarding the benefit of doubt also*

does not warrant acquittal of the accused by resort to surmises, conjectures or fanciful considerations. As mentioned by us recently in the case of State of Punjab *v.* Jagir Singh, *a criminal trial is not like a fairy tale wherein one is free to give flight to one's imagination and fantasy. It concerns itself with the question as to whether the accused arraigned at the trial is guilty of the offence with which he is charged. Crime is an event in real life and is the product of the interplay of different human emotions. In arriving at the conclusion about the guilt of the accused charged with the commission of a crime, the Court has to judge the evidence by the yardstick of probabilities, intrinsic worth and the animus of witnesses. Every case in the final analysis would have to depend upon its own facts. Although the benefit of every reasonable doubt should be given to the accused, the Courts should not at the same time reject evidence which is ex facie trustworthy on grounds which are fanciful or in the nature of conjectures."*

28. The decision in ***Kali Ram*** (supra) further cautions that wrongful acquittal and wrongful conviction do not stand on the same footing, for conviction of an innocent person causes grave injustice and shakes public confidence in the administration of criminal justice. The rule of benefit of doubt, therefore, is not technical; it is a substantive safeguard flowing from the presumption of innocence.

29. In ***Ghurey Lal v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2008) 10 SCC 450: (2009) 1 SCC (Cri) 60***, this Court reiterated the limited scope of interference with acquittals. This Court observed:

"75. The Trial Court has the advantage of watching the demeanour of the witnesses who have given evidence; therefore, the appellate court should be slow to interfere with the decisions of the Trial Court. An acquittal by the Trial Court should not be interfered with unless it is totally perverse or wholly unsustainable."

30. The decision in ***Ghurey Lal*** (supra) also crystallised certain propositions: first, there is a double presumption

> of innocence in favour of an acquitted accused; secondly, if two views are possible, the view favourable to the accused must prevail; thirdly, though the appellate court has the power to reappreciate evidence, it should interfere only when the acquittal is manifestly illegal, perverse or results in miscarriage of justice; and fourthly, due weight must be given to the Trial Court's findings, particularly because the trial judge had the advantage of observing the demeanour of witnesses.
>
> **31.** In ***Chandrappa v. State of Karnataka (2007) 4 SCC 415: (2007) 2 SCC (Cri) 325***, this Court held that though the appellate court has full power to review and re-appreciate the evidence, the presumption of innocence is strengthened by an order of acquittal. It was held that when two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal.
>
> **32.** The same principle was restated in ***Mrinal Das v. State of Tripura (2011) 9 SCC 479***, wherein this Court held that an order of acquittal is to be interfered with only when there are compelling and substantial reasons for doing so. If two reasonable views are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal.
>
> **33.** Therefore, the question before us is not whether another view on the evidence is possible. The question is whether the view taken by the Trial Court and affirmed by the High Court is impossible, perverse, wholly unsustainable, or manifestly illegal. Having examined the record, we are unable to hold so.

13. While dealing with the appeal against the acquittal in a complaint filed for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held in ***Rohitbhai Jivanlal Patel v. State of Gujarat (2019) 18 SCC 106*** that

the normal rules with the same rigour cannot be applied to the cases under the Negotiable Instruments Act because there is a presumption that the holder had received the cheque for consideration to discharge the debt/liability. The Appellate Court is entitled to look into the evidence to determine whether the accused has discharged the burden or not. It was observed: -

> **"12....** The principles aforesaid are not of much debate. In other words, ordinarily, the appellate court will not be upsetting the judgment of acquittal, if the view taken by the trial court is one of the possible views of the matter and unless the appellate court arrives at a clear finding that the judgment of the trial court is perverse, i.e. not supported by evidence on record or contrary to what is regarded as normal or reasonable; or is wholly unsustainable in law. Such general restrictions are essential to remind the appellate court that an accused is presumed to be innocent unless proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and a judgment of acquittal further strengthens such presumption in favour of the accused. However, such restrictions need to be visualised in the context of the particular matter before the appellate court and the nature of the inquiry therein. The same rule with the same rigour cannot be applied in a matter relating to the offence under Section 138 of the NI Act, particularly where a presumption is drawn that the holder has received the cheque for the discharge, wholly or in part, of any debt or liability. Of course, the accused is entitled to bring on record the relevant material to rebut such presumption and to show that the preponderance of probabilities is in favour of his defence, but while examining if the accused has brought about a probable defence so as to rebut the presumption, the appellate court is certainly entitled to

> examine the evidence on record in order to find if preponderance indeed leans in favour of the accused.
>
> **13.** For determination of the point as to whether the High Court was justified in reversing the judgment and orders of the trial court and convicting the appellant for the offence under Section 138 of the NI Act, the basic questions to be addressed are twofold: as to whether the complainant Respondent 2 had established the ingredients of Sections 118 and 139 of the NI Act, so as to justify drawing of the presumption envisaged therein; and if so, as to whether the appellant-accused had been able to displace such presumption and to establish a probable defence whereby, the onus would again shift to the complainant?"

14. The present appeal has to be decided as per the parameters laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

15. The ingredients of the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act were explained in ***Kuntegowda v. Thurubaiah, 2026 SCC OnLine SC 1485*** as under:

> **5.3.** At this juncture, it is pertinent to highlight the key ingredients as highlighted by this Court in the case of ***Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Pennar Peterson Securities Ltd., (2000) 2 SCC 745; 2000 SCC (Cri) 546: (2000) 100 COMP CAS 755***.
>
> > "10. On a reading of the provisions of Section 138 of the NI Act, it is clear that the ingredients which are to be satisfied for making out a case under the provision are:
> >
> > (i) a person must have drawn a cheque on an account maintained by him in a bank for payment of a certain amount of money to another person

out of that account for the discharge of any debt or other liability;

(ii) that the cheque has been presented to the bank within a period of six months from the date on which it is drawn or within the period of its validity, whichever is earlier;

(iii) that the cheque is returned by the bank unpaid, either because the amount of money standing to the credit of the account is insufficient to honour the cheque or that it exceeds the amount arranged to be paid from that account by an agreement made with the bank;

(iv) the payee or the holder in due course of the cheque makes a demand for the payment of the said amount of money by giving a notice in writing to the drawer of the cheque, within 15 days of the receipt of information by him from the bank regarding the return of the cheque as unpaid;

(v) the drawer of such cheque fails to make payment of the said amount of money to the payee or the holder in due course of the cheque within 15 days of the receipt of the said notice.

11. If the aforementioned ingredients are satisfied, then the person who has drawn the cheque shall be deemed to have committed an offence. In the explanation to the section, clarification is made that the phrase "debt or other liability" means a legally enforceable debt or other liability.

5.4. The ingredients of the offence under Section 138 are as follows:

i. The drawing of a cheque by a person on an account maintained by him with the banker for the payment of any amount of money to another from that account.

ii. The cheque being drawn for the discharge in whole or in part of any debt or other liability.

iii. Presentation of the cheque to the bank within the period of six months or within the period of its validity.

iv. The return of the cheque by the drawee bank as unpaid either because the amount of money standing to the credit of that account is insufficient to honour the cheque or because it exceeds the amount arranged to be paid from that account.

v. A notice by the payee or the holder in due course making a demand for the payment of the amount to the drawer of the cheque within thirty days of the receipt of information from the bank in regard to the return of the cheque.

vi. Failure of the drawer of the cheque to make payment of the amount of money to the payee or the holder in due course within fifteen days of the receipt of the notice.

vii. Filing of the complaint within a month from the date of expiry of the grace period of fifteen days before a Metropolitan Magistrate or a Judicial Magistrate not below first class.

16. The complainant had specifically stated in para 2 of the complaint that he had arranged money and advanced it to the accused in the second week of October, 2010. However, he stated in his proof affidavit (Ext.CW2/A) that he had advanced the money to the accused in the second week of October, 2011. Therefore, the conclusion of the learned Trial Court cannot be faulted, as there is a variation between the complaint and the

evidence led before the Court, which makes the complainant's version highly doubtful. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dattatraya v. Sharanappa*****, *(2024) 8 SCC 573: (2024) 3 SCC (Cri) 776: 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1899*** that when the complainant made contradictory statements regarding the advancing of the loan, the presumption attached to the cheque will not help him. It was observed:

> 30. Admittedly, the appellant was able to establish that the signature on the cheque in question was of the respondent and, in regard to the decision of this Court in ***Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar, (2019) 4 SCC 197: (2019) 2 SCC (Civ) 309: (2019) 2 SCC (Cri) 40***, a presumption is to ideally arise. However, in the above-referred context of the factual matrix, the inability of the appellant to put forth the details of the loan advanced, and his contradictory statements, the ratio therein would not impact the present case to the effect of giving rise to the statutory presumption under Section 139 of the NI Act, 1881. The respondent has been able to shift the weight of the scales of justice in his favour through the preponderance of probabilities.
>
> 31. The trial court had rightly observed that the appellant was not able to plead even a valid existence of a legally recoverable debt, as the very issuance of a cheque is dubious based on the fallacies and contradictions in the evidence adduced by the parties. Furthermore, the fact that the respondent had inscribed his signature on the agreement drawn on white paper and not on stamp paper, as presented by the appellant, creates another set of doubts in the case. Since the accused has been able to cast a shadow of doubt on the case presented by the appellant, he

has therefore successfully rebutted the presumption stipulated by Section 139 of the NI Act, 1881.

17. It was submitted that the affidavit (Ext.CW2/A) contains some clerical error because it was mentioned in para 2 of the affidavit that a post-dated cheque bearing the date 16.08.2011 was issued in the complainant's favour, which is not possible, had the money been advanced in the second week of October 2011. This submission will not help the complainant because once the complainant had asserted in his proof affidavit that the money was advanced in the second week of October 2011, the learned Trial Court was justified in holding that there was a variation between the complaint and the proof affidavit. The view of the learned Trial Court cannot be said to be unreasonable merely because another view is possible by analysing the evidence.

18. The complainant stated in his cross-examination that the money was lying in his house because he had received the money from his *Aadti*. He had maintained the documents of the receipt of the money. He had also received some money from Delhi, and he could produce the documents regarding the receipt of the money. The complainant produced the bills marked C1 to

Mark C35 issued by *Aadti* from Chandigarh, Rajgarh and Delhi. If the amount mentioned in Mark C1 to Mark C35 is added, the same does not add up to ₹3,50,000/-. Therefore, the learned Trial Court was justified in holding that the complainant had failed to establish his financial capacity.

19. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Tedhi Singh Versus Narayan Dass Mahant (2022) 6 SCC 735*** that the accused has a right to demonstrate that the complainant did not have the financial capacity to advance the loan stated to have been advanced by him. It was observed: -

> "9....However, the accused has the right to demonstrate that the complainant in a particular case did not have the capacity and therefore, the case of the accused is acceptable, which he can do by producing independent materials, namely, by examining his witnesses and producing documents. It is also open to him to establish the very same aspect by pointing to the materials produced by the complainant himself. He can further, more importantly, achieve this result through the cross-examination of the witnesses of the complainant. Ultimately, it becomes the duty of the Courts to consider carefully and appreciate the totality of the evidence and then come to a conclusion whether, in the given case, the accused has shown that the case of the complainant is in peril for the reason that the accused has established a probable defence."

20. It was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Basalingappa Versus Mudibasappa (2019) 5 SCC 418***, that where the

financial capacity to pay ₹6,00,000/- was questioned and there was no satisfactory reply, the accused had raised a probable defence. It was observed: -

> " 30. We are of the view that when evidence was led before the Court to indicate that apart from a loan of Rs. 6 lakhs given to the accused, within 02 years, an amount of Rs. 18 lakhs has been given out by the complainant and his financial capacity being questioned, it was incumbent on the complainant to have explained his financial capacity. The court cannot insist on a person to lead negative evidence. The observation of the High Court that the trial court's finding that the complainant failed to prove his financial capacity for lending money is perverse cannot be supported. We fail to see how the trial court's findings can be termed as perverse by the High Court when it was based on consideration of the evidence, which was led on behalf of the defence."

21. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dattatraya v. Sharanappa, (2024) 8 SCC 573; (2024) 3 SCC (Cri) 776: 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1899*** that when the financial capacity of the accused is not established, the accused is entitled to acquittal. It was observed:

> **"29.**...Furthermore, there was no financial capacity or acknowledgement in his income tax returns by the appellant to the effect of having advanced a loan to the respondent. Even further, the appellant has not been able to show as to when the said loan was advanced in favour of the respondent, nor has he been able to explain as to how a cheque issued by the respondent, allegedly in favour of Mr

> Mallikarjun, landed in the hands of the instant holder, that is, the appellant."

22. A similar view was taken in ***John K. Abraham Versus Simon C. Abraham & Another (2014) 2 SCC 236,*** wherein it was held:-

> "9. It has to be stated that in order to draw the presumption under Section 118 read along with 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, the burden was heavy upon the complainant to have shown that he had required funds for having advanced the money to the accused; that the issuance of the cheque in support of the said payment advanced was true and that the accused was bound to make the payment as had been agreed while issuing the cheque in favour of the complainant."

23. It was submitted that the plea of the absence of the financial capacity was not available to the accused as he had not mentioned in the reply to the notice that the complainant does not have any financial capacity to repay the money. This submission will not help the complainant. The accused had specifically asserted in the reply to the notice that he had never taken any money from the complainant. No cheque was issued to the accused, and the complainant had misused the cheque lost by the accused. Thus, there was a denial of the whole transaction, including the financial capacity. Further, the evidence has appeared on record and cannot be ignored on a plea that the

accused had not mentioned in the reply to the notice that the complainant does not have the financial capacity to advance the loan.

24. The complainant asserted that the loan was advanced in the presence of Pratap Singh (CW3). Pratap Singh supported the complainant's version in his proof affidavit (Ext.CW3/A) and stated that the complainant had advanced the money to the accused in the second week of October, 2010. However, he stated in his cross-examination that he had never met the accused before meeting him at the complainant's house, 1½ years before the date of deposition. The learned Trial Court had rightly pointed out that his statement was recorded on 03.09.2012 and, as per his testimony, the money was advanced in October 2010, which would be 2 years and not 1½ years from the date of the deposition of this witness. Thus, the learned Trial Court was justified in discarding the testimony of this witness.

25. It was submitted that the cheque carried with it a presumption that it was issued for consideration to discharge the liability. There can be no dispute with the proposition of law that a cheque carries with it a presumption that it was issued for

consideration in discharge of the liability; however, the presumption is rebuttable, and can be rebutted by the cross-examination of the complainant's witnesses or the evidence led by the accused. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajesh Jain v. Ajay Singh, (2023) 10 SCC 148: 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1275,*** that the presumption applies in the absence of evidence and disappears after the evidence is produced. It was observed:

> "38. ***John Henry Wigmore [John Henry Wigmore and the Rules of Evidence: The Hidden Origins of Modern Law]*** *on Evidence* states as follows:
>
> > "The peculiar effect of the presumption of law is merely to invoke a rule of law compelling the Jury to reach the conclusion in the absence of evidence to the contrary from the opponent, but if the opponent does offer evidence to the contrary (sufficient to satisfy the Judge's requirement of some evidence), the presumption 'disappears as a rule of law and the case is in the Jury's hands free from any rule'."

26. In the present case, the presumption was rebutted by the complainant's evidence.

27. Therefore, the learned Trial Court had taken a reasonable view while acquitting the accused and no interference is required with the reasonable view of the learned Trial Court while deciding an appeal against acquittal, even if another view is possible.

28. No other point was urged.

29. In view of the above, the present appeal fails and is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

30. In view of the provisions of Section 437 A of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Section 481 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) the respondent is directed to furnish bail bond in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Registrar (Judicial) of this Court/learned Trial Court, which shall be effective for six months with a stipulation that in the event of a Special Leave Petition being filed against this judgment or on grant of the leave, the respondent on receipt of notice thereof shall appear before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

31. A copy of the judgment, along with the record of the learned Trial Court, be sent back forthwith.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

19th November, 2026
(Nikita)