

FILE NO.1H  
(For jt.)

COURT NO.3

SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

C R I M I N A L A P P E A L N O ( s ) . 4 6 8 O F 2 0 0 9 @  
S . L . P . ( C R . ) N o . 2 2 1 9 / 0 8

M / S . V . G . S A R A F & S O N S Appellant (s)

V E R S U S

H . R A N J I T H & A N R . Respondent(s)

Date:16/03 / 2009 This Appeal was called on for judgment today.

For Appellant(s)

Mr. P.V.Dinesh,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. B.V.Deepak,Adv.for

M / s . T . T . K . D e e p a k , A d v .

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat  
pronounced the judgment of the Bench comprising His  
Lordship and Hon'ble Mr. Justice Asok Kumar  
Ganguly.

Leave granted.

The Appeal is allowed.

[ S U M A N W A D H W A ]  
C O U R T M A S T E R

[ I N D U S A T I J A ]  
C O U R T M A S T E R

Signed Reportable judgment is placed on the file.

RE P O R T A B L E

I N T H E S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

C R I M I N A L A P P E L L A T E J U R I S D I C T I O N

C R I M I N A L A P P E A L N O . 4 6 8 O F 2 0 0 9  
(Arising out of SL P (CrI.) No. 2219 of 2008)

M / s V.G. Saraf and Sons

..Appellants

Versus

H. Ranjith and Anr.

..Respondents

J U D G M E N T

Dr. A R I J I T P A S A Y A T , J.

1. Leave granted.

2. Challenge in this appeal is to the order passed by a learned Single Judge of the Kerala High Court allowing the Revision Petition filed by the respondent No.1 questioning his conviction for offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (in short the 'Act'). The High Court held that the conviction entered and the sentence imposed by the Courts below were not sustainable and accordingly allowed the revision petition.

3. The primary stand of the appellants in this appeal is that the High Court erred in acquitting the accused on the ground that Ex.P6, Bill represents only for Rs.1,61,000/- and that the Ex.P1 cheque was for a sum of Rs.1,86,606.95. It is pointed out that the evidence of P W - 1 the complainant was to the effect that accused was liable to pay a sum of Rs.1,81,256.75 and the cash discount and sales tax. It is the case of the appellants that the High Court misread the evidence of P W- 1 to set aside the concurrent findings recorded by the courts below.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 on the other hand supported the judgment of the High Court.

5. It is noticed that the evidence of P W- 1 was to the effect that the accused was liable to pay Rs.1,81,256.75 and the cash discount and the sales tax. It is also seen that the appellants had produced the relevant documents to substantiate the contention that the cheque in question was issued to discharge the liability. The documents produced included the invoices, ledger and bills.

6. It is noticed that the High Court has not examined the matter in proper perspective. The probative value of the documents produced and the acceptability of the evidence of P W- 1 has not been examined. That being so, we set aside the impugned order of the High Court and remit the matter to it to consider the matter afresh taking into account the various aspects highlighted above.

7. The appeal is allowed.

..... J  
(Dr. AR I J I T PAS A Y A T)

3

..... J.  
(ASO K KU M A R GANGUL Y)

New Delhi,  
March 16, 2009