



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48667-2025
Date of decision: 01.09.2025

VIKAS

....Petitioner

Versus

ASHOK KUMAR

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

.....
RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 has been filed for quashing/setting aside of order dated 18.04.2024 passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Panipat in CRA-159-2024 dated 18.04.2024 titled as '*Vikas vs. Ashok Kumar*' filed against the judgment of conviction dated 15.03.2024 and order of sentence dated 18.03.2024 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat in CIS No.NACT/788/2019, whereby, the sentence of the petitioner was suspended and petitioner was directed to pay 20% of compensation amount within 60 days.

2. Vide judgment of conviction dated 15.03.2024 and order on quantum of sentence dated 18.03.2024 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat the petitioner was convicted and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of six months for commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act and was further directed to pay compensation to the tune of Rs.7,86,000/- (i.e. double of the cheque amount) to the complainant within a period of two months, along with



default mechanism. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred an appeal against the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat. The learned Appellate Court vide order dated 18.04.2024, suspended the sentence of the petitioner and directed the petitioner to deposit 20% of the compensation amount before the date fixed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned lower Appellate Court failed to appreciate the facts in the right perspective and imposed the condition to deposit 20% of the compensation amount mechanically and such a condition is illegal, arbitrary and in violation of the law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Criminal Appeal Nos.2741 of 2023 (@ SLP(Crl.) Nos. 4927 of 2023 *Jamboo Bhandari vs. M.P. State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and others***, decided on 04.09.2023. Speaking through Justice Abhay S. Oka, it has been held as follows:-

“6. What is held by this Court is that a purposive interpretation should be made of Section 148 of the N.I. Act. Hence, normally, Appellate Court will be justified in imposing the condition of deposit as provided in Section 148. However, in a case where the Appellate Court is satisfied that the condition of deposit of 20% will be unjust or imposing such a condition will amount to deprivation of the right of appeal of the appellant, exception can be made for the reasons specifically recorded.

7. Therefore, when Appellate Court considers the prayer under Section 389 of the Cr.P.C. of an petitioner who has been convicted for offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act, it is always open for the Appellate Court to consider whether it is an exceptional case which warrants



grant of suspension of sentence without imposing the condition of deposit of 20% of the fine/compensation amount. As stated earlier, if the Appellate Court comes to the conclusion that it is an exceptional case, the reasons for coming to the said 4 conclusion must be recorded.”

4. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the judgment passed in ***Jamboo Bhandari (supra)***, the lower Appellate Court was required to consider whether the case of the petitioner is an exceptional case which warrants grant of suspension of sentence without imposing the condition of deposit of 20% fine/compensation amount. The impugned order dated 18.04.2024 is hereby set aside to the extent of imposing the condition of depositing 20% of compensation amount. The learned lower Appellate Court is directed to re-examine the case after granting an opportunity to the petitioner to make submissions regarding the exceptional circumstances and decide whether it is an appropriate case that warrants waiver of the requirement of deposit of 20% of the compensation awarded by learned trial Court.

5. The matter is remanded back to the learned lower Appellate Court with a direction to decide the matter afresh in accordance with law in the light of judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jamboo Bhandari's case (supra)***.

7. The petition is disposed of accordingly.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

01.09.2025

puneet

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No