



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

214-1

**CRR-4415-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.08.2025**

M/s. Kissan Seed Store and another

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

214-2

**CRR-4422-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.08.2025**

Sudarshan Kumar

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

214-3

**CRR-4423-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.08.2025**

Sudarshan Kumar

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

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

Present :- Mr. Kapil Khanna, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. Navyuggeet Brar, Advocate for
Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. These three revision petitions are being decided by a common judgment since they arise from three separate complaint(s) filed with respect



to three different cheques issued for discharging an admitted liability of Rs.8,20,000/- by the petitioner(s). Facts are however being extracted from **CRR-4415-2017** titled as '***M/s. Kissan Seed Store and another Vs. State of Punjab and another***'.

2. Perusal of the case files shows that 03 cheques were issued bearing No.014779 dated 02.01.2015 for a sum of Rs. 3,00,000/- drawn on HDFC Bank Branch, Balachaur; cheque No.337234 dated 29.12.2014 for a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- drawn on Punjab National Bank, Branch at Balachaur; and cheque No.650805 dated 19.01.2015 for a sum of Rs.2,20,000/- drawn on State Bank of India, Branch at Balachaur. It is recorded that on presentation, all these three cheques were dishonoured on the ground "Funds Insufficient" vide Bank memo dated 24.01.2015. Legal notice was served by the respondent(s)-complainant(s) and on failure of the petitioner(s) to repay the cheque amount, the complaint(s) in question were instituted.

3. Parties led their respective evidence and on consideration of the same, vide judgment dated 19.11.2015, the petitioner was convicted by the Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Balachaur in the respective complaint cases bearing No.13/2 of 2015 titled as 'Karnail Singh Vs. M/s. Kissan Seed Store and another'; complaint No.10/2 of 2015 titled as 'Karnail Singh Vs. Sudarshan Kumar'; and complaint No.9/2 of 2015 titled as 'Karnail Singh Vs. Sudarshan Kumar' and was sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of one year and fine of Rs.10,000/- each.

4. Aggrieved thereof, Criminal Appeal No. 32 of 2015 titled as 'M/s Kissan Seed Store and another Vs. State of Punjab and another';



Appeal No.30 of 2015 titled as ‘Sudarshan Kumar Vs. State of Punjab and another’; and Appeal No.31 of 2015 titled as ‘Sudarshan Kumar Vs. State of Punjab and another’ were filed before the Court of Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar. The said criminal appeals were dismissed by the Additional Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar vide separate judgments dated 20.09.2017 thus maintaining the conviction as well as the sentence.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that he does not wish to contest the conviction at this juncture and would confine his prayer only with respect to the sentence awarded. He submits that during the pendency of these revision petitions, the dispute has already been resolved between the parties and the entire amount of liability stands repaid.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant does not dispute the same and makes a statement before this Court that since they have received the entire amount, they have no adversarial interest against the petitioner.

7. Since the counsel for the petitioner has confined his challenge and prayer only to the quantum of sentence, hence, merits of the case need not be gone into.

8. Noticing the facts that the petitioner was 52 years of age as on the date when the revision petitions were filed and currently he would be above 60 years of age; the transaction pertains to the year 2015 and already a period of more than 10 years has elapsed since the proceedings originally commenced as well as the fact that the entire cheque amount already stands



undisputedly paid, I deem it to be a fit case for reduction of sentence. The petitioner has undergone a total custody period of 4 months as against the sentence of 01 year in each complaint case.

9. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and circumstance made before this Court by the petitioner, which are duly acknowledged and admitted by the counsel for the complainant, all the three revision petitions are **partly allowed** and the sentence awarded to the petitioner(s) in each of the three complaints vide judgment dated 19.11.2015 passed by the Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Balachaur in the respective complaint cases bearing No.13/2 of 2015 titled as 'Karnail Singh Vs. M/s. Kissan Seed Store and another'; complaint No.10/2 of 2015 titled as 'Karnail Singh Vs. Sudarshan Kumar'; and complaint No.9/2 of 2015 titled as 'Karnail Singh Vs. Sudarshan Kumar' and maintained vide separate judgments dated 20.09.2017 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar in Criminal Appeal No. 32 of 2015 titled as 'M/s Kissan Seed Store and another Vs. State of Punjab and another'; Appeal No.30 of 2015 titled as 'Sudarshan Kumar Vs. State of Punjab and another'; and Appeal No.31 of 2015 titled as 'Sudarshan Kumar Vs. State of Punjab and another', is reduced to that already undergone.

10. All pending criminal misc. application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.08.2025

Mangal Singh

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