



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

150

**CRM-M No.20655 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.05.2026**

Neelam Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union Bank of India

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Baljeet Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This petition for quashing of order dated 17.04.2023, passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge Kurukshetra, hereinafter being referred to as 'Appellate Court' only, has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. The petitioner has been convicted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, hereinafter referred to as 'NI Act'.

2. The record reveals that the petitioner faced a trial in a complaint case, titled as 'Union Bank of India Vs. Neelam Rani and another', for the commission of offence punishable under Section 138/142 of NI Act. The abovementioned trial culminated into conviction of the petitioner. The learned trial Court sentenced the petitioner to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years, and also to pay compensation to the tune of double the cheque amount to the complainant within three months from the date of judgment.



3. Aggrieved of the abovementioned order, when the petitioner filed an appeal before the learned Appellate Court, and sought suspension of sentence, the learned Appellate Court by virtue of impugned order, dated 17.04.2023, suspended the sentence awarded to the petitioner, but subject to the condition, that in view of Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Act, 2018, the petitioner would have to deposit 20% of the compensation.

4. Heard.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the learned Appellate Court, while imposing the abovementioned condition, did not grant the opportunity to the petitioner to explain her hardship, and that without giving an opportunity of being heard, abovementioned harsh condition has been imposed, which in no way, can be termed to be justified.

6. While referring to the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a case of '*Jamboo Bhandari v. M.P. State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and others*', the learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that as per demand of natural justice, the learned Appellate Court should have given an opportunity to the petitioner to explain the circumstances and thereafter only pass a reasonable order with regard to deposit of a part of compensation. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, since any opportunity of being heard was not afforded to the petitioner by the learned Appellate Court, the instant case may be remanded back to the learned Appellate Court for passing a fresh order.

7. I have perused the record carefully.



8. A perusal of record shows that in this case, against the cheque amount of Rs.20,60,129/-, the compensation awarded by the learned trial Court is double the cheque amount. If the condition imposed by the learned Appellate Court, i.e. deposit of 20% of compensation, is to be complied with, it may amount to hardship to the petitioner. In addition to above, it is also relevant to note that the abovesaid order has been passed without giving an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner.

9. Without issuing any notice to the respondent, lest it may delay the proceedings, the present petition is **accepted**. The impugned order is set aside. The learned Appellate Court is directed to pass a fresh order in the light of the law explained by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jamboo Bhandari's*** case (*supra*).

10. Since this order has been passed in the absence of the respondent, therefore, the respondent will be at liberty to approach this Court, in case the respondent-complainant is aggrieved by this order.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

07.05.2026

Manoj Bhutani

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