

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:135303



(248)

CRR-2123-2022(O&M)  
Date of Decision: 25.09.2025

Harpal Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

--Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.**

Present:- Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Arnav Ghai, Amicus Curiae for respondent no.2.

\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)**

CRM-38224-2022

This is an application praying for condonation of delay of 34 days that has occurred in filing the present revision petition.

In view of the averments made in the application, which is duly supported by the affidavit of petitioner, same is allowed and the aforementioned delay is condoned.

Main Case

The present revision petition has been filed against the judgement of conviction and order of sentence dated 01.03.2021 passed by learned JMIC, Hisar, whereby respondent no.2 has been convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one year for offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act and to pay

compensation to the tune of Rs.20,00,000/- to the complainant under Section 143(1) (proviso) of N.I. Act read with section 357(3) of Cr.P.C.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present petition has been filed for seeking enhancement of the sentence awarded to the respondent no.2 and that the sentence of one year awarded is on a lower side.

3. It is submitted that considering the gravity of the offence and the stake involved, higher punishment should have been awarded.

4. Learned Amicus Curiae appointed on behalf of respondent no.2 submits that the courts have taken into consideration all the mitigating circumstances as well as the counter arguments of the counsel for petitioner-complainant. He submits that there are no compelling circumstances as would necessitate the imposition of higher punishment.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the judgements passed by both the courts below.

6. The complaint pertains to the year 2019. The judgement and order of sentence was passed on 01.03.2021. The revision filed by the respondent-accused against conviction bearing CRR-947-2022 had earlier been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 21.03.2023. It is submitted that respondent no.2 has already undergone the sentence awarded.

7. Under the given circumstances, I do not deem it appropriate, at this juncture, to exercise the revisional jurisdiction to enhance the sentence awarded to respondent no.2. The revision petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.09.2025**

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No