

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 1086/2026

CNR: RJHC010676732026

URN: CRLR / 2405U / 2026

Sanjay Grover S/o Hemraj Grover, Aged About 48 Years, House No.424, Near Government School No.7 , Ward No.10 Purani Abadi, District Sriganganagar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Piyush Bajitpuriya S/o Prem Prakash Bajitpuriya, Nohara No.6 , Swami Dayanand Marg, Sriganganagar

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Ankit Ghorela

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mudit Vaishnav

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR
Order

17/07/2026

1. The petitioner was convicted for the offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act by the learned Special Judicial Magistrate (NI Act Cases) No.01, Sri Ganganagar vide judgment dated 10.12.2018 and the appeal preferred against the said judgment of conviction was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge No.2, Sri Ganganagar vide judgment dated 23.09.2024. The judgments passed by the courts below are assailed in this revision petition under Section 442 of BNSS.

2. The compromise deed dated 08.07.2026 annexed with the case file clearly reflects that the dispute between the parties has already been settled and the petitioner has deposited the entire due amount with the respondents. The offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act is compoundable as per Section 147 of the N.I. Act.

3. In this background and considering the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, the revision petition is allowed and the petitioner's conviction is set aside while compounding the offence. The impugned judgment dated 23.09.2024 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge No.2, Sri Ganganagar in Criminal Appeal No.3/2019 affirming the judgment dated 10.12.2018 passed by the learned Special Judicial Magistrate (NI Act Cases) No.01, Sri Ganganagar in Criminal Case No.1631/2010 whereby the petitioner was convicted and sentenced for the offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act are hereby quashed and set aside. The petitioner is acquitted from the charges. However, since the dispute has been resolved after long lapse of time and the precious time of the Courts have been spent by the parties, thus, in light of the Supreme Court Judgment in the case of ***Damodar S. Prabhu Vs. Sayed Babulal H., reported in AIR 2010 SC 1907*** it is deemed appropriate to impose a cost of Rs.5,000/- upon the petitioner.

The petitioner is directed to deposit a cost of Rs.5,000/- with the Rajasthan High Court Lawyers Association, Jodhpur. It is further made clear that if the cost of proceedings i.e. Rs.5,000/- is not deposited by the petitioner, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the learned trial court shall be rejuvenated without any reference to the Court.

4. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(KULDEEP MATHUR),J