



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

120

CRM-22433-2025 in/and
CRR No.1422 of 2025
Date of decision: 27.05.2025

JATINDER KUMAR

.... Petitioner

Versus

M/S PUNJAB LEASING

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Shubham Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (oral)**CRM-22433-2025**

This applicationn has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 41 days
in filing the present petition

For the reasons, assigned in the application, the same is allowed and
delay of 41days in filing the present petition is condoned.

Main case

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of order dated 03.01.2025 passed by learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Sangrur passed in CRA/11/2025 titled *Jatinder Kumar vs. M/s Punjab Leasing*, whereby, while deciding the application filed by the respondent, the petitioner had been directed to deposit 20% of the compensation amount to the respondent.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the impugned order is not sustainable in the eyes of law as learned appellate Court, while giving such direction, failed to consider the fact that deposit of 20% of the compensation amount was not absolute requirement for suspension of sentence and this condition was to be imposed in exceptional circumstances.



Hence, it is urged that the impugned order passed by the appellate Court is liable to be set aside. To fortify his argument, he has placed reliance upon the judgments passed by the co-ordinate Benches of this Court in ***Abdul Rashid vs. Kuldeep Singh, CRM-M-3878-2024***, decided on 24.01.2024, ***Sarif Mohammad @ Sareef Mohammad vs. Swaran Singh and another, CRM-M-20840-2024***, decided on 26.04.2024, ***Vikram Singh and another vs. Nasar and another, CRM-M-6508-2024***, decided on 08.02.2024 ***and Sahil Puri vs. Sonu Kumar and another, CRM-M-2503-2024***, decided on 18.01.2024.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record.

4. On a perusal of the record, it is revealed that the learned trial Court, vide judgment 09.12.2024, passed in a complaint filed under Section 138 of N. I. Act, had held the petitioner guilty for commission of offence punishable under the aforementioned section and apart from awarding sentence to undergo simple imprisonment for a period one year, had also directed him to pay compensation to the tune amount i.e. ₹4,00,289/-. The petitioner challenged the order passed by the trial Court by filing aforesaid appeal before the learned appellate Court and the appellate Court, vide order dated 03.01.2025, suspended the sentence of petitioner and had directed to the petitioner to deposit 20% of the compensation amount to the respondent.

5. In ***Jamboo Bhandari vs. M. P. State Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. And others : (2024) 1 SCC (Cri) 90***, it was observed Hon'ble Supreme Court that deposit of 20% of the compensation amount was not an absolute requirement for suspension of sentence, if the Court is satisfied



that the condition of such deposit will be unjust or imposing of such a condition will amount to deprivation of the right of appeal of the appellant. This proposition of law is shown to have been followed by the co-ordinate Benches of this Court in **Abdul Rashid's** case (supra) as well as afore cited other similar cases. In the instant case, while imposing condition of deposit of 20% of compensation amount, the learned appellate Court is not shown to have given any opportunity to the petitioner to make submissions regarding the exceptional circumstances warranting requirement of waiver of depositing of 20% of compensation amount and is shown to have imposed the said condition without the same. Therefore, keeping in view the settled proposition of law to the effect that the appellate Court was firstly required to consider as to whether the instant case falls within the exceptions warranting grant of suspension of sentence without imposing condition of deposit of 20% of compensation amount/fine, the impugned order dated 03.01.2025 cannot be stated to be sustainable to the extent to which the condition of deposit of 20% of the compensation amount was imposed. Accordingly, the same is set aside to that extent. The matter is remanded to learned appellate Court for deciding the same afresh after re-examining the case by granting an opportunity to the petitioner to make submissions regarding exceptional circumstances warranting waiver of requirement of depositing 20% of the compensation amount in pursuance of judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jamboo Bhandari's** case (supra). The petition stands disposed of.

27.05.2025
Jyoti-IV

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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