



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

286

CRM-A-2233-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.09.2025

HARNEK SINGH

...Applicant(s)

VERSUS

NARINDER SINGH

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Ms. Tvesha Gupta, Legal Aid Counsel
for the applicant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-29848-2019

Prayer in the application is for condonation of delay of 42 days in filing the application.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 42 days in filing the application is condoned.

CRM-A-2233-2019

The present application has been preferred under Section 378(4) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter 'CR.P.C.') seeking grant of leave to appeal against the judgment of acquittal dated 15.05.2019 passed by the Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Rupnagar, in a case stemming from complaint dated 09.02.2016 filed under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

2. The complaint (supra) was filed on the ground of dishonour of cheque of Rs.21,00,000/-. After assessing all the material available on the



CRM-A-2233-2019 (O&M)

-2-

record, the learned trial Court acquitted the respondent(s) vide judgment dated 15.05.2019.

3. It is noticed that the instant application pertains to the year 2019, however, no one has entered appearance on behalf of the applicant(s), hence, it is deemed expedient to nominate a Legal Aid Counsel Ms. Tvesha Gupta, Advocate, who is present in the Court, is appointed as the Legal Aid Counsel to represent the case on behalf of applicant(s) to arrive at a decision. She has gone through the case file and submits that the present application has been filed against the judgment of acquittal dated 15.05.2019 passed by the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rupnagar, in complaint RT-46-2016 filed under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. She fairly submits that in view of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***M/s. Celestium Financial vs. A. Gnanasekaran Etc., 2025(3) RCR (Criminal) 208***, the applicant would have a remedy before the Court of Sessions.

4. A copy of The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***M/s. Celestium Financial vs. A. Gnanasekaran Etc., 2025(3) RCR (Criminal) 208***, after considerable discussion and comparative interpretation of Sections 372 and 378(4) of Cr.P.C., concluded that the victim has a right to file an appeal under Section 372 of Cr.P.C. before the Court of Sessions. Speaking through Justice B.V. Nagarathna, the following was held:

“7.12 *The reasons for the above distinction are not far to see and can be elaborated as follows:*

Firstly, *the victim of a crime must have an absolute right to prefer an appeal which cannot be circumscribed by any condition precedent. In the instant case, a victim under Section 138 of the Act, i.e., a payee or the holder of a cheque is a*



CRM-A-2233-2019 (O&M)

-3-

person who has suffered the impact of the offence committed by a person who is charged of the offence, namely, the accused, whose cheque has been dishonoured.

Secondly, *the right of a victim of a crime must be placed on par with the right of an accused who has suffered a conviction, who, as a matter of right can prefer an appeal under Section 374 of the Cr.P.C. A person convicted of a crime has the right to prefer an appeal under Section 374 as a matter of right and not being subjected to any conditions. Similarly, a victim of a crime, whatever be the nature of the crime, unconditionally must have a right to prefer an appeal.*

Thirdly, *it is for this reason that the Parliament thought it fit to insert the proviso to sub-section 372 without mandating any condition precedent to be fulfilled by the victim of an offence, which expression also includes the legal representatives of a deceased victim who can prefer an appeal.*

On the contrary, as against an order of acquittal, the State, through the Public Prosecutor can prefer an appeal even if the complainant does not prefer such an appeal, though of course such an appeal is with the leave of the court. However, it is not always necessary for the State or a complainant to prefer an appeal. But when it comes to a victim's right to prefer an appeal, the insistence on seeking special leave to appeal from the High Court under Section 378(4) of the Cr.P.C. would be contrary to what has been intended by the Parliament by insertion of the proviso to Section 372 of the Cr.P.C.

Fourthly, *the Parliament has not amended Section 378 to circumscribe the victim's right to prefer an appeal just as it has with regard to a complainant or the State filing an appeal. On the other hand, the Parliament has inserted the proviso to Section 372 so as to envisage a superior right for the victim of an offence to prefer an appeal on the grounds mentioned therein as compared to a complainant.*



CRM-A-2233-2019 (O&M)

-4-

Fifthly, the involvement of the State in respect of an offence under Section 138 of the Act is conspicuous by its absence. This is because the complaint filed under that provision is in the nature of a private complaint as per Section 200 of the Cr.P.C. and Section 143 of the Act by an express intention incorporates the provisions of the Cr.P.C. in the matter of trial of such a deemed offence tried as a criminal offence. Therefore, the complainant, who is the victim of a dishonour of cheque must be construed to be victim in terms of the proviso to Section 372 read with the definition of victim under Section 2(wa) of the Cr.P.C.”

5. Therefore, in view of the judgment rendered by the Apex Court in *Celestium Financial (supra)*, the present application seeking leave to appeal is **remanded** to the learned Sessions Judge, Rupnagar with a direction to treat the same as an appeal filed under Section 372 of the Cr.P.C. and entrust the same to appropriate Court for its disposal on merits.

6. The Registry is directed to send the complete paper-book and the record of the case to the learned Sessions Judge, Rupnagar forthwith.

7. Disposed of accordingly. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

02.09.2025

Vishal Sharma

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