



CRR-637-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(129)

CRR-637-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 12.03.2026

Richhpal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Satish Kumar

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 20.01.2026, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind, in CRA No.244/2025 titled "Richhpal Singh versus Satish Kumar etc.", whereby the learned Appellate Court directed the petitioner to deposit 10% of the compensation under Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, as a pre condition to grant suspension of sentence during pendency of appeal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was convicted in complaint under Section 138 of N.I.Act, and sentenced to undergo two years simple imprisonment and to pay compensation of Rs.46,52,000/- along with interest vide order dated 07/08.08.2025 passed by learned JMIC, Safidon; aggrieved against the said order, petitioner preferred an appeal before learned Sessions Judge, Jind, who vide order dated 20.01.2026 passed in CRA-244-2025, mechanically directed the petitioner to deposit 10% of the compensation amount under Section 148 of Negotiable Instruments Act whereas as per Section 148 of Negotiable Instruments Act, Court "may" exercise its discretionary power but learned Appellate Court on the request of learned counsel for the complainant,



CRR-637-2026 2

directed the petitioner to deposit 10% of the compensation. Hence, prayer for quashing the impugned order is made.

3. Heard.
4. Main contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that direction given to the petitioner / appellant to deposit 10% of compensation be waived off. Perusal of impugned order dated 20.01.2026, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind, in CRA No.244/2025 titled “Richhpal Singh versus Satish Kumar etc.” shows that the order is specific and has been passed after taking into consideration the contentions of both the counsel for the parties.
5. Hence, finding no illegality or irregularity in the order passed by learned Appellate Court, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

12.03.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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