IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr. Revision No. 432 of 2025
Reserved on: 02.04.2026.
Decided on: 24.04.2026

Hoshiar Singh ..... Petitioner

Versus

Rakesh Kumar .... Respondent

Coram

Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1] *No.*

For the Petitioner : Mr G R Palsra, Advocate
For the Respondent : Mr Vinod Chauhan, Advocate

Rakesh Kainthla, Judge

The present revision is directed against the judgment dated 20.06.2025 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. (learned Appellate Court) vide which judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 24.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. (learned Trial Court) were upheld. *(Parties shall hereinafter be referred to in the same*

---

[1] *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment?Yes.*

2026:HHC:13277

manner as they were arrayed before the learned Trial Court for convenience.)

2. Briefly stated, the facts giving rise to the present revision 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 Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (in short, 'NI Act'). It was asserted that the parties were known to each other. The accused asked for ₹5,50,000 from the complainant, and the complainant advanced the amount to the accused. The accused issued a cheque of ₹5,50,000 drawn on State Bank of India, Degree College Mandi, District Mandi, to discharge his liability. The complainant deposited the cheque in his bank, and it was dishonoured with an endorsement “insufficient funds'. The complainant issued a demand notice to the accused asking him to pay the amount within 15 days. Notice was returned with an endorsement of unclaimed, which is a deemed service. The accused failed to pay the money despite the deemed service of the notice. Hence, a complaint was filed before the learned Trial Court against the accused for taking action as per law.

2026:HHC:13277

3. 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 himself (CW1) to prove his complaint.

5. The accused, in his statement recorded under section 313 Cr. P.C. denied the complainant's case in its entirety. He stated that he had taken a loan from Kashmir Singh and had issued a security cheque to him. Kashmir Singh did not return the cheque, and the complainant misused the cheque. He examined Bhavdev (DW1) and himself (DW2) to prove his defence.

6. Learned Trial Court held that the cheque carries with it a presumption that it was issued for consideration to discharge debt/liability. The accused failed to rebut the presumption. The plea taken by him that the cheque was handed over to Kashmir Singh, as security was not proved by producing any satisfactory evidence. The accused failed to show any relationship between the complainant and Kashmir Singh.

2026:HHC:13277

The cheque was dishonoured with endorsement "insufficient funds", and the notice was served upon the accused. All the ingredients of the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act were duly satisfied. Hence, the learned Trial Court convicted the accused of the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act, and sentenced him to undergo simple imprisonment for six months, pay a compensation of ₹11,00,000/- and in default of the payment of compensation to undergo further simple imprisonment for 5 months.

7. Being aggrieved by the judgment and order passed by the learned Trial Court, the accused filed an appeal, which was decided by the learned Sessions Judge, Mandi (learned Appellate Court). The learned Appellate Court concurred with the findings recorded by the learned Trial Court that a cheque carries with it a presumption that it was issued for consideration to discharge the debt/liability. The plea taken by the accused that he had issued the cheque as security to Kashmir Singh was not proved. Even if the cheque was issued as a security, it would attract the provisions of section 138 of the NI Act. The cheque was dishonoured with the endorsement "insufficient funds". Notice of demand was served upon the

2026:HHC:13277

accused, and he failed to repay the amount despite receipt of a valid notice of demand. The learned Trial Court had rightly convicted the accused. The sentence imposed by the learned Trial Court was adequate, and no inference was required with it. Hence, the appeal was dismissed.

8. Being aggrieved by the judgments and order passed by the learned Courts below, the accused has filed the present revision asserting that the learned Courts below erred in appreciating the material placed before them. The complainant failed to prove the existence of a legally enforceable debt/liability. The returning memo was issued on 28/02/2018, and a legal notice was issued on 19/03/2018. The complaint was filed on 07/07/2018, which is beyond the period of limitation. The complainant admitted in his cross-examination that Kashmir Singh was known to him, the accused had borrowed the money from Kashmir Singh, and Kashmir Singh had taken two security cheques from the accused. These admissions probablised the defence taken by the accused. The complainant claimed that he had given money to the accused in the presence of Dr Sanjeev, but Dr Sanjeev was not examined by the complainant, and an adverse inference should have been drawn against the complainant. Therefore, it was prayed that the

present revision be allowed and the judgments and order passed by the learned Courts below be set aside.

9. I have heard Mr G. R. Palsara, learned counsel for the petitioner/accused and Mr Vinod Chauhan, learned counsel for the respondent/complainant.

10. Mr G. R. Palsara, learned counsel for the petitioner/accused, submitted that the learned Courts below erred in appreciating the material placed before them. The complaint was barred by limitation. The plea taken by the accused that the cheque was handed over to Kashmir Singh as security was made probable by the cross-examination of the complainant and the defence evidence produced by the accused. The learned courts below erred in convicting the accused. Hence, he prayed that the present revision be allowed and the judgments and order passed by the learned Courts below be set aside.

11. Mr Vinod Chauhan, Ld. counsel for the respondent/complainant, submitted that the complaint was filed within the period of limitation. The accused admitted his signature on the cheque, and a presumption that the cheque was issued in discharge of the debt/liability would be attracted.

2026:HHC:13277

The accused had failed to rebut the presumption. Both the learned Courts below had rightly convicted and sentenced the accused, and this Court should not interfere with the concurrent findings of facts recorded by the learned Courts below. Hence, he prayed that the present revision be dismissed.

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

13. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Malkeet Singh Gill v. State of Chhattisgarh*, *(2022) 8 SCC 204: (2022) 3 SCC (Cri) 348: 2022 SCC OnLine SC 786*** that a revisional court is not an appellate court and it can only rectify the patent defect, errors of jurisdiction or the law. It was observed at page 207-

> "**10.** Before adverting to the merits of the contentions, at the outset, it is apt to mention that there are concurrent findings of conviction arrived at by two courts after a detailed appreciation of the material and evidence brought on record. The High Court in criminal revision against conviction is not supposed to exercise the jurisdiction like the appellate court, and the scope of interference in revision is extremely narrow. Section 397 of the Criminal Procedure Code (in short "CrPC") vests jurisdiction to satisfy itself or himself as to the correctness, legality or propriety of any finding, sentence or order, recorded or passed, and as to the regularity of any proceedings of such inferior court. The object of the

2026:HHC:13277

provision is to set right a patent defect or an error of jurisdiction or law. There has to be a well-founded error which is to be determined on the merits of individual cases. It is also well settled that while considering the same, the Revisional Court does not dwell at length upon the facts and evidence of the case to reverse those findings.

14. This position was reiterated in ***State of Gujarat v. Dilipsinh Kishorsinh Rao, (2023) 17 SCC 688: 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1294,*** wherein it was observed at page 695:

> "**14.** The power and jurisdiction of the Higher Court under Section 397 CrPC, which vests the court with the power to call for and examine records of an inferior court, is for the purposes of satisfying itself as to the legality and regularities of any proceeding or order made in a case. The object of this provision is to set right a patent defect or an error of jurisdiction or law or the perversity which has crept in such proceedings.
>
> **15.** It would be apposite to refer to the judgment of this Court in ***Amit Kapoor v. Ramesh Chander [Amit Kapoor v. Ramesh Chander, (2012) 9 SCC 460: (2012) 4 SCC (Civ) 687: (2013) 1 SCC (Cri) 986]***, where scope of Section 397 has been considered and succinctly explained as under: (SCC p. 475, paras 12-13)
>
> > "*12.* Section 397 of the Code vests the court with the power to call for and examine the records of an inferior court for the purposes of satisfying itself as to the legality and regularity of any proceedings or order made in a case. The object of this provision is to set right a patent defect or an error of jurisdiction or law. There has to be a well-founded error, and it may not be appropriate for the court to scrutinise the orders, which, upon the face of it, bear a token of careful consideration and appear to be in accordance with law. If one looks into the various judgments of this Court, it emerges that the revisional jurisdiction can be

2026:HHC:13277

> invoked where the decisions under challenge are grossly erroneous, there is no compliance with the provisions of law, the finding recorded is based on no evidence, material evidence is ignored, or judicial discretion is exercised arbitrarily or perversely. These are not exhaustive classes, but are merely indicative. Each case would have to be determined on its own merits.
>
> *13.* Another well-accepted norm is that the revisional jurisdiction of the higher court is a very limited one and cannot be exercised in a routine manner. One of the inbuilt restrictions is that it should not be against an interim or interlocutory order. The Court has to keep in mind that the exercise of revisional jurisdiction itself should not lead to injustice ex facie. Where the Court is dealing with the question as to whether the charge has been framed properly and in accordance with law in a given case, it may be reluctant to interfere in the exercise of its revisional jurisdiction unless the case substantially falls within the categories aforestated. Even the framing of the charge is a much-advanced stage in the proceedings under CrPC."

15. It was held in ***Kishan Rao v. Shankargouda*, (2018) 8 SCC 165:** *(2018) 3 SCC (Cri) 544: (2018) 4 SCC (Civ) 37: 2018 SCC OnLine SC 651* that it is impermissible for the High Court to reappreciate the evidence and come to its conclusions in the absence of any perversity. It was observed at page 169:

> "**12.** This Court has time and again examined the scope of Sections 397/401 CrPC and the grounds for exercising the revisional jurisdiction by the High Court. In ***State of Kerala v. Puttumana Illath Jathavedan Namboodiri, (1999) 2 SCC 452: 1999 SCC (Cri) 275]***, while considering the scope of the revisional jurisdiction of the High Court, this

2026:HHC:13277

Court has laid down the following: (SCC pp. 454-55, para 5)

> *5.* ... In its revisional jurisdiction, the High Court can call for and examine the record of any proceedings to satisfy itself as to the correctness, legality or propriety of any finding, sentence or order. In other words, the jurisdiction is one of supervisory jurisdiction exercised by the High Court for correcting a miscarriage of justice. But the said revisional power cannot be equated with the power of an appellate court, nor can it be treated even as a second appellate jurisdiction. Ordinarily, therefore, it would not be appropriate for the High Court to reappreciate the evidence and come to its conclusion on the same when the evidence has already been appreciated by the Magistrate as well as the Sessions Judge in appeal, unless any glaring feature is brought to the notice of the High Court which would otherwise amount to a gross miscarriage of justice. On scrutinising the impugned judgment of the High Court from the aforesaid standpoint, we have no hesitation in concluding that the High Court exceeded its jurisdiction in interfering with the conviction of the respondent by reappreciating the oral evidence. ...”

13. Another judgment which has also been referred to and relied on by the High Court is the judgment of this Court in ***Sanjaysinh Ramrao Chavan v. Dattatray Gulabrao Phalke, (2015) 3 SCC 123: (2015) 2 SCC (Cri) 19]***. This Court held that the High Court, in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction, shall not interfere with the order of the Magistrate unless it is perverse or wholly unreasonable or there is non-consideration of any relevant material, the order cannot be set aside merely on the ground that another view is possible. The following has been laid down in para 14: (SCC p. 135)

> “*14.* ... Unless the order passed by the Magistrate is perverse or the view taken by the court is wholly unreasonable or there is non-consideration of any

2026:HHC:13277

> relevant material or there is palpable misreading of records, the Revisional Court is not justified in setting aside the order, merely because another view is possible. The Revisional Court is not meant to act as an appellate court. The whole purpose of the revisional jurisdiction is to preserve the power in the court to do justice in accordance with the principles of criminal jurisprudence. The revisional power of the court under Sections 397 to 401 CrPC is not to be equated with that of an appeal. Unless the finding of the court, whose decision is sought to be revised, is shown to be perverse or untenable in law or is grossly erroneous or glaringly unreasonable or where the decision is based on no material or where the material facts are wholly ignored or where the judicial discretion is exercised arbitrarily or capriciously, the courts may not interfere with the decision in exercise of their revisional jurisdiction."

16. This position was reiterated in ***Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar*, *(2019) 4 SCC 197: (2019) 2 SCC (Cri) 40: (2019) 2 SCC (Civ) 309: 2019 SCC OnLine SC 13,*** wherein it was observed at page 205:

> "**16.** It is well settled that in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code, the High Court does not, in the absence of perversity, upset concurrent factual findings. It is not for the Revisional Court to re-analyse and re-interpret the evidence on record.
>
> **17.** As held by this Court in ***Southern Sales & Services v. Sauermilch Design and Handels GmbH, (2008) 14 SCC 457***, it is a well-established principle of law that the Revisional Court will not interfere even if a wrong order is passed by a court having jurisdiction, in the absence of a jurisdictional error. The answer to the first question is, therefore, in the negative."

2026:HHC:13277

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

18. The ingredients of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act were explained by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kaveri Plastics v. Mahdoom Bawa Bahrudeen Noorul, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2019*** as under: -

> **5.1.1.** In ***K.R. Indira v. Dr. G. Adinarayana (2003) 8 SCC 300***, this Court enlisted the components, aspects and the acts, the concatenation of which would make the offence under Section 138 of the Act complete, to be these (i) drawing of the cheque by a person on an account maintained by him with a banker, for payment to another person from out of that account for discharge in whole/in part of any debt or liability, (ii) presentation of the cheque by the payee or the holder in due course to the bank, (iii) returning the cheque unpaid by the drawee bank for want of sufficient funds to the credit of the drawer or any arrangement with the banker to pay the sum covered by the cheque, (iv) giving notice in writing to the drawer of the cheque within 15 days of the receipt of information by the payee from the bank regarding the return of the cheque as unpaid demanding payment of the cheque amount, and (v) failure of the drawer to make payment to the payee or the holder in due course of the cheque, of the amount covered by the cheque within 15 days of the receipt of the notice.

19. It was asserted in the memorandum of revision that the complaint is barred by limitation because the returning memo was issued on 28/02/2018, legal notice was served on 19/03/2018, but the complaint was filed on 07/07/2018. It was rightly submitted on behalf of the accused that this is a positive

2026:HHC:13277

mis-statement because the complaint was filed on 26/04/2018 and not on 07/07/2018. Therefore, the very basis of the submission that the complaint was filed on 07/07/2018 is factually incorrect, and it cannot be said that the complaint as barred by limitation

20. The accused claimed that he had issued the cheque in favour of Kashmir Singh. This shows that the issuance of the cheque and the signature of the accused are not disputed. The learned Courts below had rightly held that once the signatures on the cheque and issuance of the cheque are not disputed, a presumption would be triggered that the cheque was issued in discharge of the debt/liability. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***APS Forex Services (P) Ltd. v. Shakti International Fashion Linkers (2020) 12 SCC 724,*** that when the issuance of a cheque and signature on the cheque are not disputed, a presumption would arise that the cheque was issued in discharge of the legal liability. It was observed: -

> "9. Coming back to the facts in the present case and considering the fact that the accused has admitted the issuance of the cheques and his signature on the cheque and that the cheque in question was issued for the second time after the earlier cheques were dishonoured and that even according to the accused some amount was due and payable, there is a presumption under Section 139 of the NI Act that there exists a legally enforceable debt or

> liability. Of course, such a presumption is rebuttable. However, to rebut the presumption, the accused was required to lead evidence that the full amount due and payable to the complainant had been paid. In the present case, no such evidence has been led by the accused. The story put forward by the accused that the cheques were given by way of security is not believable in the absence of further evidence to rebut the presumption, and more particularly, the cheque in question was issued for the second time after the earlier cheques were dishonoured. Therefore, both the courts below have materially erred in not properly appreciating and considering the presumption in favour of the complainant that there exists a legally enforceable debt or liability as per Section 139 of the NI Act. It appears that both the learned trial court as well as the High Court have committed an error in shifting the burden upon the complainant to prove the debt or liability, without appreciating the presumption under Section 139 of the NI Act. As observed above, Section 139 of the Act is an example of reverse onus clause and therefore, once the issuance of the cheque has been admitted and even the signature on the cheque has been admitted, there is always a presumption in favour of the complainant that there exists legally enforceable debt or liability and thereafter, it is for the accused to rebut such presumption by leading evidence."

21. It was laid down in ***N. Vijay Kumar v. Vishwanath Rao N., 2025 SCC OnLine SC 873***, wherein it was held as under:

> "6. Section 118 (a) assumes that every negotiable instrument is made or drawn for consideration, while Section 139 creates a presumption that the holder of a cheque has received the cheque in discharge of a debt or liability. Presumptions under both are rebuttable, meaning they can be rebutted by the accused by raising a probable defence."

22. A similar view was taken in ***Sanjabij Tari v. Kishore S. Borcar, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2069,*** wherein it was observed:

2026:HHC:13277

> *"ONCE EXECUTION OF A CHEQUE IS ADMITTED, PRESUMPTIONS UNDER SECTIONS 118 AND 139 OF THE NI ACT ARISE*
>
> 15. In the present case, the cheque in question has admittedly been signed by the Respondent No. 1-Accused. This Court is of the view that once the execution of the cheque is admitted, the presumption under Section 118 of the NI Act that the cheque in question was drawn for consideration and the presumption under Section 139 of the NI Act that the holder of the cheque received the said cheque in discharge of a legally enforceable debt or liability arises against the accused. It is pertinent to mention that observations to the contrary by a two-Judge Bench in ***Krishna Janardhan Bhat v. Dattatraya G. Hegde, (2008) 4 SCC 54,*** have been set aside by a three-Judge Bench in ***Rangappa*** (supra).
>
> 16. This Court is further of the view that by creating this presumption, the law reinforces the reliability of cheques as a mode of payment in commercial transactions.
>
> 17. Needless to mention that the presumption contemplated under Section 139 of the NI Act is rebuttable. However, the initial onus of proving that the cheque is not in discharge of any debt or other liability is on the accused/drawer of the cheque [See: ***Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar, (2019) 4 SCC 197***].

23. Thus, the Court has to start with the presumption that the cheque was issued in discharge of the liability for consideration, and the burden is upon the accused to rebut this presumption.

24. The accused, Hoshiar Singh (DW2), stated that he had taken the loan of ₹ 2 Lacs from Kashmir Singh to start his business and handed over 4 cheques to him. He stated in his

cross-examination that he had not made any complaint to the police regarding the non-return of the cheque.

25. Bhavdev (DW1) stated that the accused had taken a loan of ₹ 2 Lacs from Kashmir Singh and handed over 4 cheques to him, out of which two were in the name of Hoshiar Singh, and two were in the name of Rohit. The accused had returned the amount within 20–25 days, but Kashmir Singh had not returned the cheques. He stated in his cross-examination that he was not aware of any transaction that took place between the parties in the year 2018. He was not aware of any cheque issued by the accused in favour of the complainant.

26. The learned Courts below had rightly rejected the defence taken by the accused. The accused had not reported the fact to any person that his cheques were not returned by Kashmir Singh. He had not even made any complaint to the bank asking it to stop the payment to secure his interest. The accused has not explained why the name of Kashmir Singh did not appear on the cheques if they were handed over to Kashmir Singh. Statement of the Bhavdev (DW1) is highly vague, and he could not deny the transaction between the complainant and

2026:HHC:13277

the accused. Hence, the learned Courts below were justified in rejecting the defence version.

27. The complainant denied in his cross-examination that the accused had taken the loan from Kashmir Singh. He volunteered to say that the accused had taken the loan from him (the complainant). He admitted that Kashmir Singh had taken two security cheques from the accused. However, this admission will not help the accused because the cheque in the present case was not connected to the cheque handed over as security to Kashmir Singh. Therefore, the cross-examination of the complainant does not help the case of the accused.

28. The complainant stated in his cross-examination that the money was advanced in the presence of Dr Sanjeev. It was submitted that Dr Sanjeev was not examined, and the complainant's case was not proved. This submission will not help the accused. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Uttam Ram v. Devinder Singh Hudan, (2019) 10 SCC 287: 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1361***, that a presumption under Section 139 of the NI Act would obviate the requirement to prove the existence of consideration. It was observed:

> **"20.** The trial court and the High Court proceeded as if the appellant was to prove a debt before the civil court,

2026:HHC:13277

wherein the plaintiff is required to prove his claim on the basis of evidence to be laid in support of his claim for the recovery of the amount due. An dishonour of a cheque carries a statutory presumption of consideration. The holder of the cheque in due course is required to prove that the cheque was issued by the accused and that when the same was presented, it was not honoured. Since there is a statutory presumption of consideration, the burden is on the accused to rebut the presumption that the cheque was issued not for any debt or other liability."

29. This position was reiterated in ***Ashok Singh v. State of U.P., 2025 SCC OnLine SC 706,*** wherein it was observed:

> "**22.** The High Court while allowing the criminal revision has primarily proceeded on the presumption that it was obligatory on the part of the complainant to establish his case on the basis of evidence by giving the details of the bank account as well as the date and time of the withdrawal of the said amount which was given to the accused and also the date and time of the payment made to the accused, including the date and time of receiving of the cheque, which has not been done in the present case. Pausing here, such presumption on the complainant, by the High Court, appears to be erroneous. The onus is not on the complainant at the threshold to prove his capacity/financial wherewithal to make the payment in discharge of which the cheque is alleged to have been issued in his favour. Only if an objection is raised that the complainant was not in a financial position to pay the amount so claimed by him to have been given as a loan to the accused, only then would the complainant would have to bring before the Court cogent material to indicate that he had the financial capacity and had actually advanced the amount in question by way of loan. In the case at hand, the appellant had categorically stated in his deposition and reiterated in the cross-examination that he had withdrawn the amount from the bank in Faizabad (Typed Copy of his deposition in the paperbook wrongly

2026:HHC:13277

mentions this as 'Firozabad'). The Court ought not to have summarily rejected such a stand, more so when respondent no. 2 did not make any serious attempt to dispel/negate such a stand/statement of the appellant. Thus, on the one hand, the statement made before the Court, both in examination-in-chief and cross-examination, by the appellant with regard to withdrawing the money from the bank for giving it to the accused has been disbelieved, whereas the argument on behalf of the accused that he had not received any payment of any loan amount has been accepted. In our decision in ***S. S. Production v. Tr. Pavithran Prasanth, 2024 INSC 1059***, we opined:

> '*8. From the order impugned, it is clear that though the contention of the petitioners was that the said amounts were given for producing a film and were not by way of return of any loan taken, which may have been a probable defence for the petitioners in the case, but rightly, the High Court has taken the view that evidence had to be adduced on this point which has not been done by the petitioners. Pausing here, the Court would only comment that the reasoning of the High Court, as well as the First Appellate Court and Trial Court, on this issue is sound.* ***Just by taking a counter-stand to raise a probable defence would not shift the onus on the complainant in such a case, for the plea of defence has to be buttressed by evidence, either oral or documentary, which in the present case has not been done. Moreover, even if it is presumed that the complainant had not proved the source of the money given to the petitioners by way of loan by producing statement of accounts*** *and/or Income Tax Returns,* ***the same ipso facto, would not negate such claim for the reason that the cheques having being issued and signed by the petitioners has not been denied, and no evidence has been led to show that the respondent lacked capacity to provide the amount(s) in question.*** *In this regard, we may make profitable reference to the decision in* ***Tedhi Singh v. Narayan Dass Mahant, (2022) 6 SCC 735****:*

2026:HHC:13277

> *'10. The trial court and the first appellate court have noted that* ***in the case under Section 138 of the NI Act, the complainant need not show in the first instance that he had the capacity. The proceedings under Section 138 of the NI Act are not a civil suit. At the time, when the complainant gives his evidence, unless a case is set up in the reply notice to the statutory notice sent, that the complainant did not have the wherewithal, it cannot be expected of the complainant to initially lead evidence to show that he had the financial capacity.*** *To that extent, the courts in our view were right in holding on those lines. 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, further 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.****'(emphasis supplied)' (underlining in original; emphasis supplied by us in bold).*

30. A similar view was taken in ***Sanjay Sanjabij Tari v. Kishore S. Borcar, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2069***, wherein it was observed:

2026:HHC:13277

> "21. This Court also takes judicial notice of the fact that some District Courts and some High Courts are not giving effect to the presumptions incorporated in Sections 118 and 139 of the NI Act and are treating the proceedings under the NI Act as another civil recovery proceedings and are directing the complainant to prove the antecedent debt or liability. This Court is of the view that such an approach is not only prolonging the trial but is also contrary to the mandate of Parliament, namely, that the drawer and the bank must honour the cheque; otherwise, trust in cheques would be irreparably damaged."

31. Therefore, the complainant's case cannot be doubted because Dr Sanjeev was not examined.

32. There is no other evidence to rebut the presumption attached to the cheque, and the learned Courts below had rightly held that the accused had failed to rebut the presumption attached to the cheque.

33. The complainant stated that the cheque had been dishonoured with the endorsement "insufficient funds". This was duly proved by memo (Ex.CW-1/C) wherein the reason of dishonour was mentioned as "insufficient funds." It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Mandvi Cooperative Bank Ltd. v. Nimesh B. Thakore*, *(2010) 3 SCC 83: (2010) 1 SCC (Civ) 625: (2010) 2 SCC (Cri) 1: 2010 SCC OnLine SC 155*** that the memo issued by the Bank is presumed to be correct and the burden is

2026:HHC:13277

upon the accused to rebut the presumption. It was observed at page 95:

> **24.** Section 146, making a major departure from the principles of the Evidence Act, provides that the bank's slip or memo with the official mark showing that the cheque was dishonoured would, by itself, give rise to the presumption of dishonour of the cheque, unless and until that fact was disproved. Section 147 makes the offences punishable under the Act compoundable.

34. In the present case, no evidence was produced to rebut the presumption, and the learned Courts below had rightly held that the cheque was dishonoured with an endorsement 'insufficient funds.'

35. The complainant stated in his proof affidavit (Ex. CW1/A) that the registered letter containing the notice was returned with an endorsement 'unclaimed'. His statement is corroborated by the envelope (Ex. CW-1/F) in which an endorsement was made that 'the addressee was not available despite repeated visits.' This envelope was sent to the address at which the service of the accused was effected. The accused also furnished the same address in his statement recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and the notice of accusation. Therefore, the notice was sent to the correct address. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***D. Vinod Shivappa v. Nanda Belliappa, (2006) 6 SCC 456: (2006) 3 SCC (Cri) 114: 2006 SCC OnLine SC 629***,

2026:HHC:13277

that a notice returned with an endorsement "house locked" would lead to a presumption that the notice was validly served and the burden would be upon the accused to show that the report is incorrect. It was observed at page 462:

> "**14.** If a notice is issued and served upon the drawer of the cheque, no controversy arises. Similarly, if the notice is refused by the addressee, it may be presumed to have been served. This is also not disputed. This leaves us with the third situation where the notice could not be served on the addressee for one or the other reason, such as his non-availability at the time of delivery, or premises remaining locked on account of his having gone elsewhere, etc. etc. If in each such case the law is understood to mean that there has been no service of notice, it would completely defeat the very purpose of the Act. It would then be very easy for an unscrupulous and dishonest drawer of a cheque to make himself scarce for some time after issuing the cheque so that the requisite statutory notice can never be served upon him, and consequently, he can never be prosecuted. There is good authority to support the proposition that once the complainant, the payee of the cheque, issues notice to the drawer of the cheque, the cause of action to file a complaint arises on the expiry of the period prescribed for payment by the drawer of the cheque. If he does not file a complaint within one month of the date on which the cause of action arises under clause (*c*) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act, his complaint gets barred by time. Thus, a person who can dodge the postman for about a month or two, or a person who can get a fake endorsement made regarding his non-availability, can successfully avoid his prosecution because the payee is bound to issue notice to him within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of information from the bank regarding the return of the cheque as unpaid. He is, therefore, bound to issue the legal notice, which may be

2026:HHC:13277

returned with an endorsement that the addressee is not available at the given address.

xxxxx

18. This Court noticed the position well settled in law that the notice refused to be accepted by the drawer can be presumed to have been served on him. In that case, the notice was returned as "unclaimed" and not as refused. The Court posed the question, "Will there be any significant difference between the two so far as the presumption of service is concerned?" Their Lordships referred to Section 27 of the General Clauses Act and observed that the principle incorporated therein could profitably be imported in a case where the sender had dispatched the notice by post with the correct address written on it. Then it can be deemed to have been served on the sendee, unless he proves that it was not really served and that he was not responsible for such non-service. This Court dismissed the appeal preferred by the drawer, holding that where the notice is returned by the addressee as unclaimed, such date of return to the sender would be the commencing date in reckoning the period of 15 days contemplated in clause (*c*) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act. This would be without prejudice to the right of the drawer of the cheque to show that he had no knowledge that the notice was brought to his address. Since the appellant did not attempt to discharge the burden to rebut the aforesaid presumption, the appeal was dismissed by this Court. The aforesaid decision is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it was held that the principle incorporated in Section 27 of the General Clauses Act would apply in a case where the sender dispatched the notice by post with the correct address written on it, but that would be without prejudice to the right of the drawer of the cheque to show that he had no knowledge that the notice was brought to his address."

36. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***C.C. Allavi Haji vs. Pala Pelly Mohd. 2007(6) SCC 555,*** that

when a notice is returned unclaimed, it is deemed to be served.

It was observed:

> "8. Since in ***Bhaskaran's case (supra)***, the notice issued in terms of Clause (b) had been returned unclaimed and not as refused, the Court, posed the question: "Will there be any significant difference between the two so far as the presumption of service is concerned?" It was observed that though Section 138 of the Act does not require that the notice should be given only by "post", yet in a case where the sender has dispatched the notice by post with the correct address written on it, the principle incorporated in Section 27 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 (for short 'G.C. Act') could profitably be imported in such a case. It was held that in this situation service of notice is deemed to have been effected on the sendee unless he proves that it was not really served and that he was not responsible for such non-service."

37. This position was reiterated in ***Priyanka Kumari vs. Shailendra Kumar (13.10.2023- SC Order): MANU/ SCOR/ 133284/ 2023,*** wherein it was observed:

> "As it was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K. Bhaskaran Vs. Sankaran Vaidhyan Balan and Another, (1999) 7 Supreme Court Cases 5***10, that when notice is returned as 'unclaimed', it shall be deemed to be duly served upon the addressee, and it is a proper service of notice. In the case of ***Ajeet Seeds Limited Vs. K. Gopala Krishnaiah (2014) 12 SCC 685 (2014)***, the Hon'ble Court, while interpreting Section 27 of the General Clauses Act 1897 and also Section 114 of the Evidence Act 1872, held as under: -
>
> > "Section 114 of the Evidence Act, 1872, enables the court to presume that in the common course of natural events, the communication sent by post would have been delivered at the address of the addressee. Further, Section 27 of the General

> Clauses Act, 1897 gives rise to a presumption that service of notice has been effected when it is sent to the correct address by registered post. It is not necessary to aver in the complaint that, despite the return of the notice unserved, it is deemed to have been served or that the addressee is deemed to have knowledge of the notice. Unless and until the contrary is proved by the addressee, service of notice is deemed to have been effected at the time at which the letter would have been delivered in the ordinary course of business."

38. A similar view was taken in ***Krishna Swaroop Agarwal v. Arvind Kumar, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1458,*** wherein it was observed:

> **"13.** Section 27 of the General Clauses Act, 1887, deals with service by post:
>
> > "27. **Meaning of Service by post.**-Where any [Central Act] or Regulation made after the commencement of this Act authorizes or requires any document to be served by post, whether the expression "serve" or either of the expressions "give" or "send" or any other expression is used, then, unless a different intention appears, the service shall be deemed to be effected by properly addressing, pre-paying and posting by registered post, a letter containing the document, and, unless the contrary is proved, to have been effected at the time at which the letter would be delivered in the ordinary course of post".
>
> **14.** The concept of deemed service has been discussed by this Court on various occasions. It shall be useful to refer to some instances:
>
> > 14.1 In ***Madan and Co. v. Wazir Jaivir Chand (1989) 1 SCC 264,*** which was a case concerned with the payment of arrears of rent under the J&K Houses and Shops Rent Control Act, 1966. The proviso to

2026:HHC:13277

Section 11, which is titled "Protection of a Tenant against Eviction", states that unless the landlord serves notice upon the rent becoming due, through the Post Office under a registered cover, no amount shall be deemed to be in arrears. Regarding service of notice by post, it was observed that in order to comply with the proviso, all that is within the landlord's domain to do is to post a pre-paid registered letter containing the correct address and nothing further. It is then presumed to be delivered under Section 27 of the GC Act. Irrespective of whether the addressee accepts or rejects, "*there is no difficulty, for the acceptance or refusal can be treated as a service on, and receipt by the addressee.*"

14.2 In the context of Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 it was held that when the payee dispatches the notice by registered post, the requirement under Clause (b) of the proviso of Section 138 of the NI Act stands complied with and the cause of action to file a complaint arises on the expiry of that period prescribed in Clause (c) thereof. [See: ***C.C. Alavi Haji v. Palapetty Mouhammed (2007) 6 SCC 555***]

14.3 The findings in ***C.C. Alavi*** (supra) were followed in Vishwabandhu ***v. Srikrishna (2021) 19 SCC 549***. In this case, the summons issued by the Registered AD post was received back with endorsement "refusal". In accordance with Sub-Rule (5) of Order V Rule 9 of CPC, refusal to accept delivery of the summons would be deemed to be due service in accordance with law. To substantiate this view, a reference was made to the judgment referred to supra.

14.4 A similar position as in ***C.C. Alavi*** (supra) stands adopted by this Court in various judgments of this Court in ***Greater Mohali Area Development Authority v. Manju Jain (2010) 9 SCC 157; Gujarat Electricity Board v. Atmaram Sungomal Posani (1989) 2 SCC 602; CIT v. V. K. Gururaj (1996) 7 SCC 275; Poonam Verma v. DDA (2007) 13 SCC 154; Sarav Investment & Financial Consultancy (P) Ltd. v. Lloyds Register of Shipping***

2026:HHC:13277

> ***Indian Office Staff Provident Fund (2007) 14 SCC 753; Union of India v. S.P. Singh (2008) 5 SCC 438; Municipal Corpn., Ludhiana v. Inderjit Singh (2008) 13 SCC 506***; and ***V.N. Bharat v. DDA (2008) 17 SCC 321.***

39. In the present case, the accused has not proved that he was not responsible for non-service; therefore, the learned Courts below had rightly held that the notice was deemed to be served upon the accused.

40. In any case, it was laid down in ***C.C. Allavi Haji vs. Pala Pelly Mohd. 2007(6) SCC 555,*** that the person who claims that he had not received the notice has to pay the amount within 15 days from the date of the receipt of the summons from the Court and in case of failure to do so, he cannot take the advantage of the fact that notice was not received by him. It was observed:

> "It is also to be borne in mind that the requirement of giving notice is a clear departure from the rule of Criminal Law, where there is no stipulation of giving notice before filing a complaint. *Any drawer who claims that he did not receive the notice sent by post, can, within 15 days of receipt of summons from the court in respect of the complaint under Section 138 of the Act, make payment of the cheque amount and submit to the Court that he had made payment within 15 days of receipt of summons (by receiving a copy of the complaint with the summons) and, therefore, the complaint is liable to be rejected. A person who does not pay within 15 days of receipt of the summons from the Court along with the copy of the complaint under Section 138 of the Act, cannot obviously contend that there was no proper service of notice as required under Section*

> *138, by ignoring statutory presumption to the contrary under Section 27 of the G.C. Act and Section 114 of the Evidence Act.* In our view, any other interpretation of the proviso would defeat the very object of the legislation. As observed in ***Bhaskaran's case*** (supra), if the giving of notice in the context of Clause (b) of the proviso was the same as the receipt of notice, a trickster cheque drawer would get the premium to avoid receiving the notice by adopting different strategies and escape from the legal consequences of Section 138 of the Act." (Emphasis supplied)

41. The accused did not claim that he had repaid the amount to the complainant; therefore, it was duly proved on record that the accused had failed to repay the amount despite the receipt of the notice.

42. Therefore, it was duly proved before the learned Trial Court that the accused had issued a cheque to discharge his legal liability, the cheque was dishonoured with an endorsement 'insufficient funds', and the accused failed to pay the money despite the deemed receipt of a notice of demand. Hence, all the ingredients of the offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act were duly satisfied, and the learned Trial Court had rightly convicted the accused for the commission of the offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act.

2026:HHC:13277

43. Learned Trial Court sentenced the accused to undergo simple imprisonment for six months and pay compensation of ₹11,00,000/- to the complainant. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar, (2019) 4 SCC 197: (2019) 2 SCC (Cri) 40: (2019) 2 SCC (Civ) 309: 2019 SCC OnLine SC 138*** that the penal provision of section 138 is deterrent in nature. It was observed at page 203:

> "6. The object of Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act is to infuse credibility into negotiable instruments, including cheques, and to encourage and promote the use of negotiable instruments, including cheques, in financial transactions. The penal provision of Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act is intended to be a deterrent to callous issuance of negotiable instruments such as cheques without serious intention to honour the promise implicit in the issuance of the same."

44. Keeping in view the deterrent nature of the punishment, the sentence of six months cannot be said to be excessive.

45. The learned Trial Court awarded the compensation of ₹ 11,00,000/- on 24.12.2024. The cheque was issued on 15.02.2018. Thus, the compensation was imposed after more than six years. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kalamani Tex v. P. Balasubramanian, (2021) 5 SCC 283: (2021) 3 SCC (Civ) 25: (2021) 2 SCC (Cri) 555: 2021 SCC OnLine SC 75*** that

the Courts should uniformly levy a fine up to twice the cheque amount along with simple interest at the rate of 9% per annum. It was observed at page 291: -

> 19. As regards the claim of compensation raised on behalf of the respondent, we are conscious of the settled principles that the object of Chapter XVII of NIA is not only punitive but also compensatory and restitutive. The provisions of NIA envision a single window for criminal liability for the dishonour of a cheque as well as civil liability for the realisation of the cheque amount. It is also well settled that there needs to be a consistent approach towards awarding compensation, and unless there exist special circumstances, the courts should uniformly levy fines up to twice the cheque amount along with simple interest @ 9% p.a. [***R. Vijayan v. Baby, (2012) 1 SCC 260, para 20: (2012) 1 SCC (Civ) 79: (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 520***]"

46. The interest on ₹ 5,50,000/- for 2504 days @ 9 % p.a. would be ₹ 3,39,584/- Learned Trial Court awarded a compensation of ₹5,50,000/- which is excessive and is reduced to ₹ 3, 50,000/-. Thus, the accused is liable to pay ₹9,00,000/- (₹5,50,000+₹3,50,000/-) as compensation.

47. It was submitted that the learned Trial Court could not have awarded the sentence of imprisonment in case of default in the payment of compensation. This submission is not acceptable. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K.A. Abbas v. Sabu Joseph, (2010) 6 SCC 230: 2010 SCC OnLine SC 612,*** the Courts can impose a sentence of imprisonment in

2026:HHC:13277

default of payment of compensation. It was observed at page 237:

> "**26.** From the above line of cases, it becomes very clear that a sentence of imprisonment can be granted for default in payment of compensation awarded under Section 357(3) CrPC. The whole purpose of the provision is to accommodate the interests of the victims in the criminal justice system. Sometimes the situation becomes such that there is no purpose served by keeping a person behind bars. Instead, directing the accused to pay an amount of compensation to the victim or affected party can ensure the delivery of total justice. Therefore, this grant of compensation is sometimes in lieu of sending a person to bars or in addition to a very light sentence of imprisonment. Hence, in default of payment of this compensation, there must be a just recourse. Not imposing a sentence of imprisonment would mean allowing the accused to get away without paying the compensation, and imposing another fine would be impractical, as it would mean imposing a fine upon another fine and therefore would not ensure proper enforcement of the order of compensation. While passing an order under Section 357(3), it is imperative for the courts to look at the ability and the capacity of the accused to pay the same amount as has been laid down by the cases above; otherwise, the very purpose of granting an order of compensation would stand defeated."

48. This position was reiterated in ***R. Mohan v. A.K. Vijaya Kumar, (2012) 8 SCC 721: 2012 SCC OnLine SC 486***, wherein it was observed at page 729:

> "**29.** The idea behind directing the accused to pay compensation to the complainant is to give him immediate relief so as to alleviate his grievance. In terms of Section 357(3), compensation is awarded for the loss or injury suffered by the person due to the act of the

2026:HHC:13277

> accused for which he is sentenced. If merely an order directing compensation is passed, it would be totally ineffective. It could be an order without any deterrence or apprehension of immediate adverse consequences in case of its non-observance. The whole purpose of giving relief to the complainant under Section 357(3) of the Code would be frustrated if he is driven to take recourse to Section 421 of the Code. An order under Section 357(3) must have the potential to secure its observance. Deterrence can only be infused into the order by providing for a default sentence. If Section 421 of the Code puts compensation ordered to be paid by the court on a par with the fine so far as the mode of recovery is concerned, then there is no reason why the court cannot impose a sentence in default of payment of compensation, as it can be done in case of default in payment of a fine under Section 64 IPC. It is obvious that in view of this, in ***Vijayan [(2009) 6 SCC 652: (2009) 3 SCC (Cri) 296]***, this Court stated that the abovementioned provisions enabled the court to impose a sentence in default of payment of compensation and rejected the submission that the recourse can only be had to Section 421 of the Code for enforcing the order of compensation. Pertinently, it was made clear that observations made by this Court in ***Hari Singh [(1988) 4 SCC 551: 1988 SCC (Cri) 984]*** are as important today as they were when they were made. The conclusion, therefore, is that the order to pay compensation may be enforced by awarding a sentence in default.
>
> **30.** In view of the above, we find no illegality in the order passed by the learned Magistrate and confirmed by the Sessions Court in awarding a sentence in default of payment of compensation. The High Court was in error in setting aside the sentence imposed in default of payment of compensation.

49. Thus, there is no infirmity in imposing a sentence of imprisonment in case of default in the payment of compensation.

2026:HHC:13277

50. No other point was urged.

51. In view of the above, the present revision is partly allowed, and the amount of compensation awarded by the learned Trial Court, as affirmed by the learned Appellate Court, is reduced to ₹9, 00,000/-. Subject to this modification, the rest of the judgment and order are upheld.

52. The present petition stands disposed of, and so are the pending applications, if any.

53. A copy of the judgment, along with records of the learned Courts below, be sent back forthwith.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

24th April 2026.
(ravinder)