



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

234

CRM-A-1391-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 11.02.2026

**STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH DRUGS CONTROL OFFICE
.....APPELLANT**

VS.

SATISH KUMAR**.....RESPONDENT**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Kuldeep Sharma, Advocate
for the applicant-appellant.

(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

CRM-21813-2019

This is an application under Section 05 of the Limitation Act read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for condonation of delay of 630 days in filing the appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 630 days in filing the appeal is hereby condoned.

CRM-A-1391-2019

1. The present application has been preferred under Section 378(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter 'CR.P.C.') seeking grant of leave to appeal against the judgment of acquittal dated 10.01.2017 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak in a case stemming from complaint dated 01.06.2012 filed under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940.

2. The complaint (supra) was filed for the offences under Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 on the ground that the accused was illegally



practicing allopathic medicine and stocking/selling allopathic drugs without being a Registered Medical Practitioner and without holding a valid drug licence, in violation of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Rules, 1945. After assessing all the material available on the record, the trial Court acquitted the respondent vide judgment dated 10.01.2017.

3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M/s. Celestium Financial vs. A.Gnanasekaran Etc., 2025(3) RCR (Criminal) 208*, after considerable discussion and comparative interpretation of Sections 372 and 378(4) of Cr.P.C., concluded that the victim has a right to file an appeal under Section 372 of Cr.P.C. before the Court of Sessions. Speaking through Justice B.V. Nagarathna, the following was held:

“7.12 The reasons for the above distinction are not far to see and can be elaborated as follows:

Firstly, the victim of a crime must have an absolute right to prefer an appeal which cannot be circumscribed by any condition precedent. In the instant case, a victim under Section 138 of the Act, i.e., a payee or the holder of a cheque is a person who has suffered the impact of the offence committed by a person who is charged of the offence, namely, the accused, whose cheque has been dishonoured.

Secondly, the right of a victim of a crime must be placed on par with the right of an accused who has suffered a conviction, who, as a matter of right can prefer an appeal under Section 374 of the CrPC. A person convicted of a crime has the right to prefer an appeal under Section 374 as a matter of right and not being subjected to any conditions.

Similarly, a victim of a crime, whatever be the nature of the crime, unconditionally must have a right to prefer an appeal.



Thirdly, it is for this reason that the Parliament thought it fit to insert the proviso to sub-section 372 without mandating any condition precedent to be fulfilled by the victim of an offence, which expression also includes the legal representatives of a deceased victim who can prefer an appeal.

On the contrary, as against an order of acquittal, the State, through the Public Prosecutor can prefer an appeal even if the complainant does not prefer such an appeal, though of course such an appeal is with the leave of the court. However, it is not always necessary for the State or a complainant to prefer an appeal. But when it comes to a victim's right to prefer an appeal, the insistence on seeking special leave to appeal from the High Court under Section 378(4) of the CrPC would be contrary to what has been intended by the Parliament by insertion of the proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC.

Fourthly, the Parliament has not amended Section 378 to circumscribe the victim's right to prefer an appeal just as it has with regard to a complainant or the State filing an appeal. On the other hand, the Parliament has inserted the proviso to Section 372 so as to envisage a superior right for the victim of an offence to prefer an appeal on the grounds mentioned therein as compared to a complainant.

Fifthly, the involvement of the State in respect of an offence under Section 138 of the Act is conspicuous by its absence. This is because the complaint filed under that provision is in the nature of a private complaint as per Section 200 of the CrPC and Section 143 of the Act by an express intention incorporates the provisions of the CrPC in the matter of trial of such a deemed offence tried as a criminal offence. Therefore, the complainant, who is the victim of a dishonour of cheque must be construed to be victim in terms of the proviso to Section



372 read with the definition of victim under Section 2(wa) of the CrPC.”

4. In view of the judgment rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Celestium Financial (supra)*, this Court in *Dharampal Vs. State of Haryana & Others in CRM-A-489-MA-2017 decided on 11.08.2025*, , the learned Sessions Judge, Rohtak is directed to treat the present leave to appeal as an appeal filed under Section 372 of the Cr.P.C. and entrust the same to appropriate Court for its disposal.
5. The Registry is directed to send the complete paperbook and the record of the case to the learned Sessions Judge, Rohtak forthwith.
6. Disposed of accordingly.
7. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

11.02.2026
Kusum

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No