



CRM-M-39220-2023

1

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

269

CRM-M-39220-2023

Date of decision : 17.09.2025

PARGAT SINGH

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

PRIMARY CO-OPERATIVE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT BANK
LTD.

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Riya Mukherji, Advocate for
Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate
for the respondent.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed by the petitioner against the order dated 26.04.2023 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Fazilka (hereinafter referred to as 'Appellate Court'), whereby the application for suspension of sentence, moved by the petitioner, has been allowed and the sentence awarded to the petitioner has been suspended, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like amount within a period of 15 days and deposit of 20% of the fine/compensation imposed by learned trial Court within a period of three months before the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.



2. The record reveals that the petitioner faced a trial in a complaint case titled as 'Primary Co-operative Agriculture Development Bank Ltd. Vs. Pargat Singh' for the abovementioned offence and the abovementioned trial culminated into conviction of the petitioner. The learned trial Court sentenced the petitioner to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one year and 6 months and pay compensation of Rs.3,50,000/-.

3. Aggrieved of the abovementioned order, when the petitioner filed an appeal in the learned Appellate Court, the learned Appellate Court by virtue of impugned order dated 26.04.2023, suspended the sentence awarded to the petitioner. However, it imposed a condition in view of Section 148 of the Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Act, 2018 and directed the petitioner to deposit an amount equivalent to 20% of the amount of compensation within a period of three months.

4. Heard.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the learned Appellate Court, while imposing the abovementioned condition, did not give any opportunity to the petitioner to explain his hardship and that without giving an opportunity of being heard, the abovementioned harsh condition has been imposed. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Appellate Court has failed to appreciate that the learned trial Court has committed a grave error when against a cheque amount of Rs.3,50,000/-, it directed to pay compensation of Rs.3,50,000/- 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*', learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the learned Appellate Court was duty bound to give an opportunity to the petitioner to explain the circumstances and pass a reasonable order with regard to deposit of compensation or any part thereof. 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 after hearing the petitioner.

7. I have perused the record carefully.

8. A perusal of record shows that in this case, against the cheque amount of Rs.3,50,000/-, the compensation awarded by the learned trial Court is also equivalent to the cheque amount. If the condition imposed by the learned Appellate Court, i.e. deposit of 20% of amount of compensation, is to be complied with, it may create hardship for 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*).



CRM-M-39220-2023

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

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

vipin

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No