



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRR-241-2020
Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

SANDEEP BHATIA Petitioner
Versus
DILBAG SINGH Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner/convict.

Ms. Shivaly Singla, Advocate
legal aid counsel for the respondent/complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (ORAL)

Criminal Case before trial Court	No. 18-2 of 2015 CIS No. 659/2015 CNR No. HRSI03-009096-2015 Decided on: 26.07.2017
Criminal Appeal before Appellate Court	No. 275 CIS No. 275/2017 CNR No. HRSI0100-4604-2017 Decided on: 09.01.2020

Convict's name	Penal provision	Sentence
Sandeep Bhatia	138 of NI Act	RI for 01 year and to pay compensation under Section 357(3) CrPC of amount equivalent to two cheques amount i.e. Rs. 6,01,560/- to complainant.

Seeking setting aside of impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 26.07.2017 passed by JMIC, Sirsa convicting the petitioner and affirmed by Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, the petitioner had come up before this Court by filing the present revision petition.

2. Despite service, the respondent failed to appear, therefore, vide order dated 30.03.2026, this Court appointed a legal aid counsel on his behalf.
3. At the outset, counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be contended and satisfied if the sentence is reduced to the period already undergone, which is approximately 04 months out of 01 year in the complaint captioned above and he does not want to argue the revision petition on merits. He further submits that the cheque amount was around



Rs. 6,00,000/- and the period already undergone would translate to Rs. 5000/- per day, which is higher than the prevailing norm in the absence of the sentencing policy.

4. Legal aid counsel submits that it appears that nothing was paid and the sentence should not be reduced.

5. I have heard counsel for the petitioner as well as legal aid counsel for the respondent and its analysis would lead to the following outcome.

6. In the entirety of facts and circumstances and considering the cheque amount involved is around Rs. 6,00,000/- which would translate to Rs. 5000/- per day of custody already undergone, this Court is of the opinion that the sentence undergone by the petitioner is more than adequate.

7. Without commenting any further opinion on the merits, judgment of conviction is upheld and order of sentence is modified to the extent that the period of sentence is reduced to the period already undergone by the petitioner, which is 4 months and 12 days as per custody certificate. No specific order is being passed with regard to recovery of compensation and the same shall be governed in accordance with law.

8. With the aforesaid modification, petition stands disposed of. All pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

9. Legal aid counsel shall be entitled to her fee as per the applicable Rules.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

01.04.2026
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No