



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

**CRM-M No.16999 of 2025  
Date of decision: 27.03.2025**

Satnam Singh .....Petitioner

Versus

Jagjeet Singh .....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

**Present:** Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**H.S. GREWAL**

The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of order dated 29.01.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed in CRA-144/2022 titled as "Satnam Singh Vs. Jagjeet Singh passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar in a complaint filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner preferred an appeal before the Appellate Court after being convicted by the trial Court concerned under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 whereby he was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year and to pay compensation equivalent to cheque amount alongwith interest @ 12% per annum from the date of advancement of loan till the date of actual realization. Thereafter, the petitioner moved an application under Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, whereby vide impugned order dated 29.01.2025, the Appellate Court had directed the petitioner to deposit Rs.93,500/- that would amount to 20% of the compensation amount of Rs.4,67,500/-, after adding the interest component. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the



interest component could not have been added while calculating 20% of the amount to be deposited. Moreover, the trial Court has awarded rate of interest in excess i.e. @12% per annum to be paid alongwith compensation amount equivalent to the cheque amount.

3. Notice of motion.

4. The nature of order this Court proposes to pass, no formal reply is required from the respondent.

5. It is observed that vide order dated 12.08.2022, the order of sentence of imprisonment was suspended till disposal of appeal subject to furnishing of bail bonds by the convict-appellant, however, the direction of payment of compensation was neither stayed nor adjudicated upon but it was specifically observed that payment of compensation as per impugned judgment and order was subject to result of appeal/ revision. As such, the appellant had not deposited any amount as per the judgment of the trial Court concerned.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

7. In view of the given facts and circumstances of the present case, the compensation amount is reduced to 20% of the original cheque amount and the petitioner is directed to deposit 20% of the original cheque amount at this stage within 60 days from today

8. Also, in the larger interest of equity and fair play, the appellate Court shall accept the appeal and decide the same on merits.

9. The present petition stands disposed of.

**27.03.2025**

*Sonia Puri*

*Whether speaking/ reasoned*

*Whether reportable*

**(H.S. GREWAL)**

**JUDGE**

: *Yes / No*

: *Yes / No*