

2026:PHHC:059032



163

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

CRM-M-20917-2026

Gurpreet Kaur

....Petitioner

versus

Munish Kumar

.....Respondent

Date of Decision: April 20, 2026**Date of Uploading: April 20, 2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:** Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 482 Cr. P.C.) seeking quashing/ setting aside of the impugned order dated 07.01.2026 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, whereby, the petitioner has been ordered to deposit 20% of the compensation amount, i.e., Rs.5,96,975/-. The relevant portion of the impugned order reads thus:

“Criminal appeal has been received by way of entrustment. It be registered. There are arguable points involved in this appeal, as such, this appeal is admitted for hearing.

Another application has been filed by appellant/applicant for suspension of sentence during the pendency of appeal and for grant of the bail to the applicant/appellant till the final decision of the appeal.

Heard on the application filed by appellant for suspension of sentence. Appeal has been admitted for hearing. Record of learned Trial Court is yet to be summoned and appeal is not likely to be disposed of in the near future, which may take sometime. No useful purpose would be served for sending the appellant in custody for that much period. Therefore, instant application is allowed and sentence of imprisonment is suspended till the decision of appeal, on furnishing personal/surety bonds

to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate within 15 days and after the acceptance and attestation of the bonds, the same be sent to this Court for record.

Perusal of the judgment dated 11.12.2025 further reveals that the Ld. Trial Court has also directed the appellant/accused to pay compensation to the tune of Rs.5,96,975/- to the complainant. Thus, in the light of the amended provision of Section 148 of the NI Act, the appellant is directed to deposit 20% of the total amount of compensation awarded by the trial Court within 60 days from today. Notice of the appeal be issued to respondent for 11.03.2026.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is a housewife having no source of income to deposit the directed amount of compensation and even the husband of the petitioner, who is a small time agriculturist, is also having nothing with him to help the petitioner, in this regard. Learned counsel has further iterated that imposition of such condition of deposit of 20% of the amount of compensation as awarded by the learned trial Magistrate would effectively amount to taking away the right of appeal of the petitioner. Thus, it has been submitted that the impugned order be quashed, to the extent, that a condition of deposit of 20% of the amount of compensation as awarded by the trial Court, has been imposed.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper-book.

4. Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, introduced through the 2018 amendment, empowers appellate courts to mandate the deposit of at least 20% of the fine or compensation amount by the accused as a condition for hearing an appeal against a conviction in cheque dishonour cases under Section 138. This provision aims to address the prolonged litigation faced by complainants and mitigate delays in receiving compensation, ensuring a balance between the accused person's right to appeal and the complainant's right to speedy justice. The amount deposited

can be released to the complainant, reflecting the legislative intent to provide timely relief and deter frivolous appeals.

At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as *Jamboo Bhandari vs. M.P. State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. & Ors. 2023 (10) SCC 446*; relevant whereof reads 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.”

5. The convict bears the onus of demonstrating exceptional circumstances to persuade the appellate court to waive the mandatory deposit of compensation under Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. Considering the legislative intent behind the provision, which seeks to expedite justice and alleviate the complainant's hardship due to prolonged litigation, it is generally appropriate for the appellate court to impose this

condition when an appeal is filed against a conviction under Section 138. Such a requirement ensures that the complainant is not unjustly deprived of compensation while safeguarding the appellate process from frivolous or dilatory tactics. Under Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, the requirement to deposit the compensation amount as a condition for appeal is generally mandatory, emphasizing its status as a rule.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgment titled as ***Muskan Enterprises & Anr. Vs. The State of Punjab 2024 INSC 1046***, has held thus:

“xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx. While there can be no gainsaying that normally the discretion of the Appellate Court should lean towards requiring a deposit to be made with the quantum of such deposit depending upon the factual situation in every individual case, more so because an order under challenge does not bear the mark of invalidity on its forehead, retention of the power of such court not to order any deposit in a given case (which in its view and for the recorded reasons is exceptional) and calling for exercise of the discretion to not order deposit, has to be conceded. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.”

Ergo, the ratio decidendi of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in cases of ***Jamboo Bhandari*** (supra) and ***Muskan Enterprises*** (supra) enunciates that the appellate Court holds the discretion to waive this condition only in exceptional circumstances. Such circumstances must be demonstrated through compelling and substantiated material provided by the appellant-convict. Absent such cogent material, it would be inappropriate for appellate Court to impose such condition. This approach ensures adherence to the legislative intent, discouraging frivolous appeals and protecting the interests of the complainant.

5.1. Applying the ratio decidendi of the judgments in the case of ***Jamboo Bhandari*** case (supra) and ***Muskan Enterprises*** (supra), no ground is made out to quash/modify the condition imposed vide the impugned order whereby the petitioner has been directed to deposit 20% of the amount of the compensation as awarded by the learned trial Magistrate. The ground

pleaded by the petitioner that she is facing financial difficulty cannot be said to be a ground sufficient enough for carving out an exception from the mandate contained in Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. It also cannot be said, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, that imposition of the condition of deposit of 20% of the amount of compensation as awarded by the learned trial Magistrate can be said to be unjust or would amount to effectively taking away the right of appeal of petitioner. Thus, the impugned order does not suffer from any infirmity *nay* legal infirmity calling for any interference by this Court. Accordingly, the petition in hand is **dismissed**.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

7. Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the appeal pending before the learned Sessions Court.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

April 20, 2026
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No