



CRR-48-2009

1

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

102

CRR-48-2009 (O&M)**Date of Decision: 18.04.2026**

Monika Mittal

.....Petitioner

Versus

Bank of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**Present:** Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S.Pasricha, Advocate with
Mr. Saurabh Sudhir, Advocate and
Ms. Kirti Kanwar, Advocate for respondent-bank.

RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI, J.(Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the parties state that although no written settlement has been arrived at between the parties, yet, since the amount of the cheque in question has already been paid to the bank concerned, the controversy in the present case, now, remains to be the payment of interest on the cheque amount.
2. They say that cheque amount in the present case was Rs.3,10,000/-. Mr. Aggarwal makes a statement at Bar that his client does not now challenge the impugned judgments of conviction but leniency may be shown to his client in the matter of sentence as she is ready to pay a sum of Rs.85,000/- as compensation in lieu of the interest component on the above mentioned cheque amount.
3. Mr. Pasricha, upon having instructions from Mr. Sunil Kalra,



Legal Manager, HDFC Bank, who is present through video conferencing also makes a statement at Bar that if the petitioner pays the above mentioned amount of Rs. 85,000/- as compensation in lieu of interest component against the cheque in question within a period of 90 days from today, his client has no objection if the sentence imposed upon the petitioner is ordered to be reduced to the period already undergone subject to the condition that the order to be passed in the present petition will not prejudice other litigations pending between the parties.

4. Mr. Aggarwal also makes a statement at Bar that if the petitioner does not honour the above mentioned statement within the stipulated period, the petition in question may be ordered to be dismissed for non-compliance thereof. He also states that the petitioner will provide her latest address to the respondent-bank within the said period of 90 days.

5. In view of the said statements made by the learned counsel for the parties today before this Court, the impugned judgment(s) of conviction passed against the petitioner are confirmed but the sentence imposed upon her through the impugned order(s) is reduced to the period already undergone by her in the case in question subject to she depositing Rs.85,000/- (Eighty Five Thousand only) with the respondent-bank within 90 days from today against proper receipt. It is also ordered that if the petitioner does not make the said payment of Rs.85,000/- within the above mentioned period of 90 days from today, the present petition shall be deemed to have been dismissed and the sentence imposed upon the petitioner through the impugned order(s) shall get revived. Anything mentioned in the present order shall not prejudice other litigations pending between the parties.

6. The revision petition is disposed of accordingly.



CRR-48-2009 3

7. Pending application(s), if any, is/are also disposed of.

18.04.2026
Rajeev (rvs)

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

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