



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

197

CRM-M-12528-2026

Date of Decision : 10.03.2026

NEHA

...Petitioner

VERSUS

M/S SHREE SHYAM ENTERPRISES THROUGH ITS PROPRIETOR
PRAMOD TIBREWAL

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Mr. Vikas Saroha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)

1. Challenge in the present petition is to order dated 07.11.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide which while suspending the sentence of the appellant awarded on 06.10.2025 (by learned trial Court in *Criminal Complaint No. NACT-895-2022* titled as '*M/s Shree Shyam Enterprises Vs. M/s Accurate Engnieers and others*', petitioner (appellant before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad) was directed to deposit 20% of the compensation.

2. Relevant facts as can be inferred from the documents on record are noticed hereinbelow:-

Vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 04.09.2025/06.10.2025 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad, the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous



imprisonment for a period of two months for commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of NI Act and was further directed to pay compensation i.e. Rs.9,00,000/- to the complainant. In view of application for suspension of sentence moved by the convict, learned trial Court suspended the sentence till 06.11.2025 on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Judge. The requisite bonds were furnished, accepted and attested on the same day.

Aggrieved of the said judgment, petitioner preferred an appeal bearing CRA No.1292 of 2025 before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad. Learned Appellate Court vide order dated 07.11.2025, suspended the sentence of the petitioner on her furnishing bail bonds to sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like amount and also imposed another condition of depositing of 20% of the compensation amount within a period of 60 days.

A perusal of order dated 07.11.2025 further shows that personal bonds furnished by the petitioner (appellant therein) were accepted. Her request to tender surety bond on the next date of hearing was also accepted and the case was adjourned to 15.11.2025 for furnishing surety bonds.

Learned counsel submits that on the said day i.e. on 15.11.2025, petitioner did not put in appearance. An application for seeking her exemption from appearing in the Court was allowed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge and the case was adjourned to 12.11.2025. On the said day i.e. 12.11.2025 though petitioner-appellant put in appearance but sought adjournment to tender surety bonds. Her fresh personal bonds were accepted and the case was adjourned to 20.11.2025, when requisite surety bonds were furnished, accepted and attested and case was adjourned to 15.01.2026 for depositing 20% of the compensation amount.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned Appellate Court failed to appreciate the facts of the case in the correct perspective. In purely mechanical manner, sentence so awarded by the learned trial Court was suspended subject to deposit of 20% of the compensation amount. Learned counsel submits that petitioner, who belongs to economically weaker class is facing acute financial crunch. He has a good case on merits and that if the condition so imposed while suspending the sentence is not waived off, petitioner would suffer irreparable loss. Moreover, submissions advanced by learned counsel highlighting that case of petitioner falls under exceptional category were also not taken note of by learned First Appellate Court. The said condition (depositing 20% of the compensation amount) being arbitrary and in violation of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jamboo Bhandari vs. M.P. State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and others, 2023 (180) SCL 373***, be set aside/modified.

4. Heard. Documents on record perused.

5. The question as to whether deposit of 20% of the awarded compensation amount, is mandatory while suspending the sentence, was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jamboo Bhandari (supra)***, wherein it was held as under:-

“6. What is held by this Court is that a purposive interpretation should be made of Section 148 of the N.I. Act. Hence, normally, Appellate Court will be justified in imposing the condition of deposit as provided in Section 148. However, in a case where the Appellate Court is satisfied that the condition of deposit of 20% will be unjust or imposing such a condition will amount to deprivation of the right of appeal of the appellant, exception can be made for the reasons specifically recorded.

7. Therefore, when Appellate Court considers the prayer under Section 389 of the Cr.P.C. of an accused who has been convicted for



offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act, it is always open for the Appellate Court to consider whether it is an exceptional case which warrants grant of suspension of sentence without imposing the condition of deposit of 20% of the fine/compensation amount. As stated earlier, if the Appellate Court comes to the conclusion that it is an exceptional case, the reasons for coming to the said conclusion must be recorded.

8. The submission of the learned counsel appearing for the original complainant is that neither before the Sessions Court nor before the High Court, there was a plea made by the appellants that an exception may be made in these cases and the requirement of deposit or minimum 20% of the amount be dispensed with. He submits that if such a prayer was not made by the appellants, there were no reasons for the Courts to consider the said plea.

9. We disagree with the above submission. When an accused applies under Section 389 of the Cr.P.C. for suspension of sentence, he normally applies for grant of relief of suspension of sentence without any condition. Therefore, when a blanket order is sought by the appellants, the Court has to consider whether the case falls in exception or not.

10. In these cases, both the Sessions Courts and the High Court have proceeded on the erroneous premise that deposit of minimum 20% amount is an absolute rule which does not accommodate any exception.”

6. In view of the law laid down by **Jamboo Bhandari (supra)**, learned Appellate Court was required to consider as to whether the present case falls within the exceptions or not. No specific reasons have been assigned while imposing the condition of deposit of 20% of the amount. The impugned order is, therefore, not sustainable. Present petition is disposed of with a direction to learned Appellate Court to re-examine the case afresh, after affording an



opportunity to the petitioner to address her arguments regarding exceptional circumstances warranting waiver of requirement to deposit 20% of the compensation awarded by the learned trial Court.

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

10.03.2026
Nisha Yadav

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>