



2026:PHHC:075329

2026:PHHC:075329



CRR-1241-2023 (O&M)

1

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

145

**CRR-1241-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.05.2026**

KARAMVEER

.... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Ashish Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Iqbal Mohd., Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The present revision petition has been filed against the judgment dated 20.04.2023 passed by the Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar vide which the appeal preferred by the accused-petitioner against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 07.09.2017/11.09.2017 passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sub Division Bilaspur has been dismissed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the accused-petitioner had borrowed a sum of Rs.23,40,000/- from the complainant/respondent No.2 with an assurance to return the same in near future. In order to discharge his liability, the accused-petitioner issued a cheque bearing No.000003 dated 01.06.2015 for a sum of Rs.7,02,000/- drawn at HDFC Bank, in favour of the complainant-respondent No.2. On presentation of



2026:PHHC:075329

2026:PHHC:075329



CRR-1241-2023 (O&M)

2

the aforesaid cheque by the complainant with his banker, namely, HDFC Bank, Chhachhrauli, District Yamuna Nagar, the same was not encashed and was dishonoured with the remarks 'Insufficient Funds' vide a return memo dated 10.06.2015. The accused-petitioner was served with a legal notice dated 12.06.2015. The notice was duly received, but he intentionally did not give any reply to the notice and not complied with the same, leading to initiation of proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

3. In the complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 filed by the complainant/respondent No.2, the accused/petitioner was summoned to face trial under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. The evidence was led and ultimately, the accused/petitioner was held guilty and accordingly, convicted for the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for two years along with compensation equivalent to the cheque amount, and in default of payment of compensation, further undergo simple imprisonment for one year.

4. Aggrieved against the said judgment of conviction and order of sentence, the accused/petitioner preferred an appeal before the Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar which came to be dismissed vide a judgment dated 20.04.2023.

5. Still aggrieved, the present revision petition has been preferred by the accused-petitioner.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that during

**CRR-1241-2023 (O&M)**

3

the pendency of the present petition, a compromise has been effected between the parties. As against the cheque amount of Rs.7,00,000/-, Rs.9,00,000/- has been paid vide different installments to the learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 as full and final payment. Thus, nothing remains due towards the complainant-respondent No.2. He further contends that in view of Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act read with Section 320 Cr.P.C. where a settlement has been effected, the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act can be compounded on account of the fact that a mutual compromise has been effected between the parties.

7. The learned counsel for the State-respondent No.1 and the counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 contend that as the matter has been settled between the parties, they have no objection if the prayer of the learned counsel for accused-petitioner for compounding the offence under Section 138 N.I. Act is allowed and the petitioner is acquitted of the charges framed against him.

8. I have heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

9. This Hon'ble Court in '**Ramesh Chander Vs. State of Haryana and another, 2007(1) RCR (Criminal) 245**' held as under:-

"4. As per the provisions of Section 147 of the Act, the offence under Section 138 is compoundable. Section 147 reads as under:

"Offence to be compoundable Notwithstanding anything contained in the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973(2 of 1974), every offence punishable under this Act shall be compoundable".

**CRR-1241-2023 (O&M)**

4

5. The compounding of the offence under Section 138 can be done during the trial of the case as well as by the High Court or Court of Session while acting in the exercise of its power of revision under Section 401 Criminal Procedure Code Reference may be made to Section 320(6) Criminal Procedure Code in this regard.

6. Further, under Section 320(8) Criminal Procedure Code the composition of an offence shall have the effect of acquittal of the accused with whom the offence has been compounded.”

10. This Court in 'Vatsa Electronics Vs. Pala Ram & Anr. decided on 09.03.2022 in CRR-1585-2019' has also held that once a settlement is being effected, then in terms of Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and Section 320 Cr.P.C., the accused ought to be acquitted as the offence stands compounded.

11. In view of the above, since, the parties have voluntarily settled the disputes between themselves, it is a fit case for allowing them to compound the offence.

12. Accordingly, the revision petition is allowed and subject to payment of Rs.25,000/- as costs to be deposited with Day Care Centre for Elderly Disabled in home for Old & Destitute People, Sector-15, Chandigarh is being run by Chandigarh Scheduled Castes, Backward Classes & Minorities Financial & Development Corporation, the judgment dated 20.04.2023 passed by the Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar as well as the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 07.09.2017/11.09.2017 passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sub



2026:PHHC:075329

2026:PHHC:075329



CRR-1241-2023 (O&M)

5

Division Bilaspur, are hereby set aside. The petitioner is acquitted of the charge under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

13. Since the main petition has been disposed of no order needs to be passed in the pending application(s), if any.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

13.05.2026

Kusum

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>