



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

240

**CRA-AS-124-2015 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 23.09.2025**

Sanjeev Jakhar

..... Appellant

VERSUS

Nand Kishore

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

Present: None for the appellant.

Mr. Jatinder Nagpal, Advocate, for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)**

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal against the judgment of acquittal, passed in a complaint case instituted under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as 'NI Act'), whereby, a complaint filed by the appellant was dismissed and the accused acquitted.

2. The limited question arising for consideration in the present proceedings is whether an appeal against a judgment of acquittal passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class in a complaint case, with regard to commission of offence punishable under Section 138 of NI Act, can be entertained at the instance of complainant under the proviso to Section 372 of the Cr.P.C.?



3. The issue is no longer *res integra*. In '***M/s Celestium Financial Vs. A. Gnanasekaran Etc. 2025 INSC 804 : 2025(3) RCR (Criminal) 208***' the Hon'ble Supreme Court authoritatively held that a complainant in a prosecution under Section 138 of the NI Act, qualifies as a 'victim' under Section 2(wa) of the Cr.P.C., being the person who suffers financial loss due to dishonour of a cheque. Consequently, such a complainant is entitled to pursue an appeal against acquittal under the proviso to Section 372 of the CrPC without the requirement of seeking special leave under Section 378(4) of the Cr.P.C. In the present case, although, for want of appearance of appellant, the instant appeal can be dismissed in default, yet in my opinion, the ends of justice would be better served if the instant appeal is treated as memorandum of appeal and the same is forwarded to the Sessions Judge, which will provide additional forum to the parties to redress their grievance.
4. Adopting a pragmatic and justice oriented approach and guided by the principle that procedural rule must serve and not obstruct the course of justice, this Court deems it appropriate to direct that the present appeal be treated as one authoritatively instituted under the proviso to Section 372 of CrPC. Similar view has been taken by this High Court in case CRM-A-2700-MA-2018, titled as '*Satish Kumar Vs. Jugal Kishore*'.
5. In conclusion, this Court is duty bound to harmonize contrasting provisions in a manner that best serves the interest of justice, using the method of *librere cherche scientifique* i.e. free scientific research. Therefore, in view of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Celestium Financial (supra)*** and the fact that the present appeal is



pending since 2015, learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad is directed to treat the present appeal, as an appeal filed under Section 372 of the Cr.P.C. and entrust the same to appropriate Court for its disposal.

6. The concerned Appellate Court shall proceed to decide the appeal expeditiously, without being impeded by any delay in filing the appeal, in view of the legal position now clarified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

7. The Registry is directed to transmit this order along with the copy of the complete paper-book and return the trial Court record, if received, to the learned Sessions Judge concerned.

8. Disposed of accordingly.

**(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**SEPTEMBER 23, 2025**

*Gaurav Thakur*

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No