

CNR No. DLSE01-003369-2006
CA No. 128/2026
MS. NIKHILA JOSEPH
Vs. MR. DEEPINDER SINGH

13.08.2026

Present: Appellant Nikhila Joseph is appearing through VC.
Dr. Anand Duggal, Ld. Counsel for appellant
Nikhila Joseph.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sinha and Mr. Santosh Kumar
Pandey, Ld. Counsel for respondent/complainant Deepinder
Singh along with respondent/complainant.

In the impugned judgment dated 15.11.2025, Ld.
Trial Court has convicted accused no. 1 and 3 for the offence u/s.
138 N.I. Act, accused no. 1 being a company and accused no. 3
being the director of the same. It is apprised that one of the
accused (accused no. 2) has already been expired who was also
director in the accused no. 1 company.

Present appeal preferred merely by accused no. 3 on
the ground that she has no role in day to day working of the
accused no. 1 company and thereby cannot be made by
vicariously liable for the acts of the accused no.1 company.

Detailed written submissions filed in this regard.

It is further argued that the son of the complainant
was also director in the accused no. 1 company and was never
made as an accused in the present case.

On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for respondent
submitted that in the notice issued upon accused no. 3/appellant,
her role in working of the accused no. 1 company is specifically
mentioned. It is further stated that the summoning order was

never challenged by accused no. 3/appellant. It is further argued that no such defence is raised by accused no. 3/appellant at the time of framing of notice nor she has stepped in witness box to prove her defence. It is further argued that the role of accused no. 3/appellant is specifically mentioned in the complaint so filed by the complainant.

Arguments heard from both sides.

Parties are at liberty to file written submission, on next date of hearing.

Put up for judgment on **26.09.2026**.

(ANUBHAV JAIN)
ASJ-04, South-East District
Saket Courts, New Delhi:13.08.2026