

Gautam Prasad vs State Of H.P. & Another on 9 October, 2026

2026:HHC:44344

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr. Revision No. 391 of 2014

Reserved on: 28.09.2026

Decided on: 09.10.2026

Gautam Prasad

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & another

.... Respondents

of

Coram

Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.

rt

Whether approved for reporting?1

No.

For the Petitioner

:

Mr Vaibhav Tanwar, Advocate.

For the Respondents

:

Mr Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate
General, for respondent no.1/State.
Mr Rakesh Manta, Advocate, for

respondent no.2

Rakesh Kainthla, Judge

The present revision is directed against the judgment dated 12.11.2014, passed by learned Sessions Judge, Shimla, District Shimla, H.P. (learned appellate Court), vide which the judgment of conviction, dated 21.02.2013 and order of sentence dated 10.4.2013, passed by learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, 1 Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::: CIS 2

2026:HHC:44344 Court No. III, Shimla, District Shimla, H.P. (learned trial Court) were partly upheld. (The parties shall hereinafter be referred to in .

the same manner as they were arrayed before the learned trial Court for convenience).

2. Briefly stated, the facts giving rise to the present petition are that the complainant filed a complaint before the of learned trial Court against the accused for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable rt [Instruments Act \(NI Act\)](#). It was asserted that the accused approached the complainant in his shop at Lower Bazar, Shimla, in the year 2010 and demanded ₹15,000/- for a short duration.

The complainant paid ₹15,000/- to the accused. The accused issued a cheque of ₹15,000/- to repay the amount. The complainant presented the cheque before his bank, but it was dishonoured with an endorsement 'insufficient funds'. The complainant issued a notice to the accused, which was duly served upon him, but he failed to pay the amount; hence, the complaint was filed before the Court for taking action as per the law.

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::: CIS 3

2026:HHC:44344

3. The learned trial Court found sufficient reasons to summon the accused. When the accused appeared, a notice of . accusation was put to him for the commission of an offence punishable under [Section 138](#) of the NI Act, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

4. The complainant examined himself (CW-1) to prove of his complaint.

5. The accused, in his statement recorded under Section rt 313 of the [Code of Criminal Procedure \(CrPC\)](#), admitted that he knew the complainant. He stated that he had handed over the cheque to some other person and he does not know how the cheque was found by the complainant. He did not produce any evidence in his defence.

6. Learned appellate Court held that the complainant's version that the accused had issued a cheque to him to discharge the debt/liability was duly proved on record. The explanation provided by the accused that he had handed over the cheque to some other person was not proved by any material on record. The cheque was dishonoured with an endorsement 'insufficient funds' and the accused had failed to repay the money despite the ::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::: CIS 4 2026:HHC:44344 receipt of the valid notice of demand. Hence, the learned trial Court convicted the accused of the commission of an offence .

punishable under [Section 138](#) of the NI Act and sentenced him to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months and pay compensation of ₹20,000/-.

7. Being aggrieved by the judgment and order passed by of the learned trial Court, the accused filed an appeal, which was decided by the learned Sessions Judge, Shimla, H.P. (learned rt appellate Court). The learned appellate Court concurred with the findings recorded by the learned trial Court that the accused had issued a cheque in favour of the complainant in discharge of the legal liability. The cheque was dishonoured with an endorsement 'insufficient funds'. The plea taken by the accused that he had handed over the cheque to someone else was not proved on the balance of probabilities. The learned trial Court had rightly convicted the accused. However, the sentence imposed by the learned trial Court was excessive. Hence, the learned appellate Court reduced the imprisonment for one month and increased the compensation to ₹25,000/-.

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::: CIS 5

2026:HHC:44344

8. Being aggrieved by the judgment and order passed by the learned Courts below. The accused has filed the present .

revision asserting that the learned Courts below failed to appreciate the material on record. The complainant's statement was wrongly accepted by the learned courts below. The demand notice was not served upon the accused, and the complaint was of not maintainable. Therefore, it was prayed that the present revision be allowed and the judgment and order passed by the rt learned courts below be set aside.

9. I have heard Mr Vaibhav Tanwar, counsel for the petitioner, Mr Ajit Sharma, learned Deputy Advocate General for respondent No. 1/ State and Mr Rakesh Manta, learned counsel for respondent No. 2/complainant.

10. Mr Vaibhav Tanwar, learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that the learned Courts below erred in appreciating the material on record. The complainant's statement was highly contradictory, and the learned courts below erred in relying upon it to convict the petitioner/accused.

The notice was not served upon the accused, and the proceedings before the learned trial Court were not maintainable. Therefore, :: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :: CIS 6 2026:HHC:44344 he prayed that the present revision be allowed and the judgments and order passed by the learned courts below be set aside.

.

11. Mr Ajit Sharma, learned Deputy Advocate General, for respondent No. 1/State submitted that the dispute is between the private parties and the State has no submissions to make.

12. Mr Rakesh Manta, learned counsel for respondent no.

of 2, submitted that the complainant's testimony was found to be trustworthy by the learned Courts below. This Court should not rt re-appreciate the evidence while deciding the revision.

Therefore, he prayed that the present revision be dismissed.

13. I have given a considerable thought to the submissions made at the bar and have gone through the records carefully.

14 It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Kuntegowda v. Thurubaiah, 2026 SCC OnLine SC 1485, that a revisional court does not act as an appellate court and it can only determine the correctness, legality and propriety of the findings and sentence recorded by the lower court. It was observed: -

"7. Before parting, we would like to accentuate the revisional jurisdiction of the High Courts and the contours and inherent limits while exercising powers as a revisional authority. Section :: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :: CIS 7 2026:HHC:44344 397 of the [Criminal Procedure Code](#), 1973 (now, Section 438 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) encapsulates the power of High Courts and Sessions Courts to examine the correctness, legality or propriety of any order passed by an

inferior criminal court. The said Section is extracted as hereunder:

"438. Calling for records to exercise powers of revision.--(1) The High Court or any Sessions Judge may call for and examine the record of any proceeding before any inferior Criminal Court situate within its or his local jurisdiction for the purpose of satisfying itself or himself as to the correctness, legality or propriety of any finding, of sentence or order, recorded or passed, and as to the regularity of any proceedings of such inferior Court, and may, when calling, for such record, direct that the execution of any sentence or order be suspended, and if the accused is rt in confinement that he be released on his own bond or bail bond pending the examination of the record.

Explanation. --All Magistrates, whether Executive or Judicial, and whether exercising original or appellate jurisdiction, shall be deemed to be inferior to the Sessions Judge for the purposes of this subsection and of section 439.

(2) The powers of revision conferred by sub-section (1) shall not be exercised in relation to any interlocutory order passed in any appeal, inquiry, trial or other proceeding.

(3) If an application under this section has been made by any person either to the High Court or to the Sessions Judge, no further application by the same person shall be entertained by the other of them."

Discretion in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction should be exercised within the four corners of this section whenever there has been miscarriage of justice. However, while exercising power under this section, the Court does not act as an appellate Court and therefore, while considering the legality, propriety or the correctness of a finding or a conclusion, the revisional court does not and should not dwell upon the facts and the evidence of the case as an appellate Court. The court, in revision, considers the material only to satisfy itself about the correctness, legality and propriety of the findings,

sentence and order recorded by the lower court, and should refrain from ::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::CIS 8 2026:HHC:44344 substituting its conclusion on an elaborate consideration of evidence, and the findings of the lower courts should not be reversed merely on the ground that an alternative view is possible on the facts of the case. In this case, such a position did .

not also emanate from the evidence on record.

7.1. This Court, in the [State of Maharashtra v. Jagmohan Singh Kuldip Singh Anand](#), (2004) 7 SCC 659: 2004 SCC (Cri) 2003, observed that the High Court, in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction, cannot embark upon an in-depth roving re-examination of the oral evidence and medical evidence and come to a conclusion contrary to the consistent one reached by two courts below. In the facts of the present case, in the of impugned judgment, the High Court gravely erred in upsetting the concurrent findings of conviction of the trial court and the Appellate Court by substituting its own conclusions and reasoning on the merits of the case and thereby erred in setting rt aside the well-reasoned and correct judgment and orders of the trial and appellate courts.

7.2. Upon perusal of the impugned judgment and order dated 06.10.2023, it is apparent that the High Court went into great detail into each of the testimonies, documents and merits of the case which could have been avoided, especially when the subject matter had come under its revisional jurisdiction.

Instead, acting as an appellate Court, the High Court deemed it fit to go into the merits of the case, something which is generally impermissible unless a glaring contradiction is apparent on the face of the record. In [State of Kerala v. Puttumana Illath Jathavedan Namboodiri](#), (1999) 2 SCC 452; 1999 SCC (Cri) 275, while considering the scope of the revisional jurisdiction of the High Court, this Court has laid down the following:

"5. ... In its revisional jurisdiction, the High Court can call for and examine the record of any proceedings for the purpose of satisfying itself as to the correctness, legality or propriety of any finding, sentence or order. In other words, the jurisdiction is one of supervisory jurisdiction exercised by the High Court for correcting a miscarriage of justice. But the said revisional power cannot be equated with the power of an appellate court nor can it be treated even as a second appellate jurisdiction. Ordinarily, therefore, it would not be appropriate for the High Court to reappreciate the evidence ::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::CIS 9 2026:HHC:44344 and come to its own conclusion on the same when the evidence has already been appreciated by the Magistrate as well as the Sessions Judge in appeal, unless any glaring feature is brought to the notice of the High Court which .

would otherwise tantamount to a gross miscarriage of justice. On scrutinising the impugned judgment of the High Court from the aforesaid standpoint, we have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the High Court exceeded its jurisdiction in interfering with the conviction of the Respondent by reappreciating the oral evidence. ..."

7.3. The contours for exercise of revisional jurisdiction have been well settled by the judicial dicta of this Court wherein time of and again it has been observed that the High Court shall not interfere with the orders of the lower court unless:

- i. The order or finding of the lower court is perverse, grossly rt erroneous, glaringly unreasonable or wholly unreliable or untenable in law.
- ii. The lower court has passed the impugned order after considering immaterial or irrelevant material or no material at all.
- iii. There is a non-consideration of any relevant material or the judicial discretion has been exercised arbitrarily or capriciously.

7.4. This Court, in [Sanjabij Tari v. Kishore S. Borcar](#), 2025 INSC 1158, in similar facts and circumstances wherein the High Court had reversed concurrent findings of conviction under [Section 138](#) of NI Act, while setting aside the impugned order, observed as under:

"27. It is well settled that in exercise of revisional jurisdiction, the High Court does not, in the absence of perversity, upset concurrent factual findings. This Court is of the view that it is not for the Revisional Court to reanalyse and re-interpret the evidence on record. As held by this Court in [Southern Sales & Services v. Sauermilch Design and Handels GMBH](#), (2008) 14 SCC 457, it is a well-established principle of law that the Revisional Court will not interfere, even if a wrong order is passed by a Court having jurisdiction, in the absence of a jurisdictional error.

28. Consequently, this Court is of the view that in the absence of perversity, it was not open to the High Court in ::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::CIS 10 2026:HHC:44344 the present case, in revisional jurisdiction,

to upset the concurrent findings of the Trial Court and the Sessions Court."

7.5. In the facts of the present case, we find that the High Court .

has failed to highlight any reason or material satisfaction to the effect that there was any such glaring contradiction or perversity apparent on the face of the record so as to justify the exercise of the powers under revisional jurisdiction and thereby erred in interfering with the judgment and orders of the courts below. Therefore, the present appeal has to be allowed by setting aside the impugned order of the High Court. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we are of the view that the High Court of committed an error in setting aside the order of conviction in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. No sufficient ground has been mentioned by the High Court in its judgment to enable it to exercise its revisional jurisdiction for setting aside the rt conviction.

15. The ingredients of the commission of an offence punishable under [Section 138](#) of the NI Act were explained in Kuntegowda (supra) as under:

5.3. At this juncture, it is pertinent to highlight the key ingredients as highlighted by this Court in the case of [Kusum Ingots & Alloys Ltd. v. Pennar Peterson Securities Ltd.](#), (2000) 2 SCC 745; 2000 SCC (Cri) 546: (2000) 100 COMP CAS 755.

"10. On a reading of the provisions of [Section 138](#) of the NI Act, it is clear that the ingredients which are to be satisfied for making out a case under the provision are:

- (i) a person must have drawn a cheque on an account maintained by him in a bank for payment of a certain amount of money to another person out of that account for the discharge of any debt or other liability;
- (ii) that cheque has been presented to the bank within a period of six months from the date on which it is drawn or within the period of its validity, whichever is earlier;

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 11
2026:HHC:44344

(iii) that cheque is returned by the bank unpaid, either because the amount of money standing to the credit of the account is insufficient to honour the cheque or that it exceeds the amount arranged to be paid from .

that account by an agreement made with the bank;

(iv) the payee or the holder in due course of the cheque makes a demand for the payment of the said amount of money by giving a notice in writing to the drawer of the cheque, within 15 days of the receipt of information by him from the bank regarding the return of the cheque as unpaid;

of

(v) the drawer of such cheque fails to make payment of the said amount of money to the payee or the holder in due course of the cheque within 15 days of the receipt of the said notice.

rt 11. If the aforementioned ingredients are satisfied, then the person who has drawn the cheque shall be deemed to have committed an offence. In the explanation to the section, clarification is made that the phrase "debt or other liability" means a legally enforceable debt or other liability. 5.4. The ingredients of the offence under [Section 138](#) are as follows:

- i. The drawing of a cheque by a person on an account maintained by him with the banker for the payment of any amount of money to another from that account.
- ii. The cheque being drawn for the discharge in whole or in part of any debt or other liability.
- iii. Presentation of the cheque to the bank within the period of six months or within the period of its validity.
- iv. The return of the cheque by the drawee bank as unpaid either because the amount of money standing to the credit of that account is insufficient to honour the cheque or because it exceeds the amount arranged to be paid from that account.
- v. A notice by the payee or the holder in due course making a demand for the payment of the amount to the drawer of the cheque within thirty days of the receipt of information from the bank in regard to the return of the cheque.

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 12

2026:HHC:44344 vi. Failure of the drawer of the cheque to make payment of the amount of money to the payee or the holder in due course within fifteen days of the receipt of the notice. vii. Filing of the complaint within a

month from the date of .

expiry of the grace period of fifteen days before a Metropolitan Magistrate or a Judicial Magistrate not below first class.

16. The present revision has to be decided as per the parameters [laid down by](#) the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

of

17. The complainant Manjeet Singh (CW-1) stated that the accused had taken ₹15,000/- from him in April 2010, as a loan. The accused issued a cheque for the return of the amount.

The cheque was dishonoured because of 'insufficient funds'. He served a legal notice upon the accused and received an acknowledgement (Ext.CW-1/E); however, the accused did not pay any money despite the receipt of the notice of demand. He denied in his cross-examination that the accused had not received the notice or that the notice was received by some other person.

18. His testimony that the accused had taken the loan from him and had issued the cheque to return the amount was not challenged in the cross-examination, and it is deemed to be accepted. It was [laid down by](#) the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Uttar Pradesh Versus Nahar Singh, 1998 (3) SCC 561, that where :::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::: CIS 13 2026:HHC:44344 the testimony of a witness is not challenged in the cross-

examination, the same cannot be challenged during the .

arguments. This position was reiterated in [Arvind Singh v. State of Maharashtra](#), (2021) 11 SCC 1; (2022) 1 SCC (Cri) 208; 2020 SCC OnLine SC 4, and it was held at page 34:

"58. A witness is required to be cross-examined in a criminal trial to test his veracity; to discover who he is and what his position in life is, or to shake his credit, by injuring his character, although the answer to such questions may directly or indirectly incriminate him or may directly or indirectly expose him to a penalty or forfeiture ([Section 146](#) of the [Evidence Act](#)). A witness is required to be cross-examined to bring forth inconsistencies and discrepancies, and to prove the untruthfulness of the witness. A-1 set up a case of his arrest on 1-9-2014 at 18:50 hrs; therefore, it was required for him to cross-examine the truthfulness of the prosecution witnesses with regard to that particular aspect. The argument that the accused was shown to be arrested around 19:00 hrs is an incorrect reading of the arrest form (Ex. 17). In Column 8, it has been specifically mentioned that the accused was taken into custody on 2-9-2014 at 14:30 hrs at Wanjri Layout, Police Station, Kalamna. The time, i.e. 17: 10 hrs, mentioned in Column 2 appears to be when A-1 was brought to the Police Station, Lakadganj. As per the IO, A-1 was called for interrogation as the suspicion was on an employee of Dr Chandak since the kidnapper was wearing a red colour T-shirt which was given by Dr Chandak to his employees. A-1 travelled from the stage of suspect to an accused only on 2-9-2014. Since no cross-examination was conducted on any of the prosecution witnesses about the place and manner of the arrest, the argument that the accused was arrested on 1-9-2014 at 18:50 hrs is not tenable.

59. The House of Lords, in a judgment reported as *Browne v. Dunn* (1893) 6 R 67 (HL), considered the principles of appreciation of evidence. Lord Chancellor Herschell held that it is essential to the proper conduct of a cause, where it is :::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::: CIS 14 2026:HHC:44344 intended to suggest that a witness is not speaking the truth on a particular point, to direct his attention to the fact by some questions put in cross-examination showing that imputation is intended to be made, and not to take his evidence and pass it by .

as a matter altogether unchallenged. It was held as under:

"Now, my Lords, I cannot help saying that it seems to me to be absolutely essential to the proper conduct of a cause, where it is intended to suggest that a witness is not speaking the truth on a particular point, to direct his attention to the fact by some questions put in cross-examination showing that that imputation is intended to be made, and not to take his evidence and pass it by as a matter altogether of unchallenged, and then, when it is impossible for him to explain, as perhaps he might have been able to do if such questions had been put to him, the circumstances which it is suggested indicate that the story he tells ought not to be believed, to argue that he is a witness unworthy of credit. My Lords, I have always understood that if you intend to impeach a witness you are bound, whilst he is in the box, to give him an opportunity of making any explanation which is open to him; and, as it seems to me, that is not only a rule of professional practice in the conduct of a case, but is essential to fair play and fair dealing with witnesses.

Sometimes reflections have been made upon excessive cross-examination of witnesses, and it has been complained of as undue, but it seems to me that cross-examination of a witness which errs in the direction of excess may be far more fair to him than to leave him without cross-examination, and afterwards, to suggest that he is not a witness of truth, I mean upon a point on which it is not otherwise perfectly clear that he has had full notice beforehand that there is an intention to impeach the credibility of the story which he is telling."

60. Lord Halsbury, in a separate but concurring opinion, held as under:

"My Lords, with regard to the manner in which the evidence was given in this case, I cannot too heartily express my concurrence with the Lord Chancellor as to the mode in which a trial should be conducted. To my mind, nothing would be more absolutely unjust than not to cross-examine witnesses upon evidence which they :::
Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 15 2026:HHC:44344 have given, so as to give them notice, and to give them an opportunity of explanation, and an opportunity very often to defend their own character, and, not having given them such an opportunity, to ask the jury .

afterwards to disbelieve what they have said, although not one question has been directed either to their credit or to the accuracy of the facts they have deposed to."

61. This Court, in a judgment reported as *State of U.P. v.*

Nahar Singh, (1998) 3 SCC 561: 1998 SCC (Cri) 850, quoted from *Browne v. Dunn*, (1893) 6 R 67 (HL) to hold that in the absence of cross-examination on the explanation of delay, the evidence of PW 1 remained unchallenged and ought to have been believed by the High Court. [Section 146](#) of the Evidence Act confers a valuable right of cross-examining the witness tendered in evidence by the opposite party. This Court held as under: (*State of U.P. v. Nahar Singh*, (1998) 3 SCC 561: 1998 SCC (Cri) 850], SCC pp. 566-67, para 13) "13. It may be noted here that part of the statement of PW 1 was not cross-examined by the accused. In the absence of cross-examination on the explanation of the delay, the evidence of PW 1 remained unchallenged and ought to have been believed by the High Court. [Section 138](#) of the Evidence Act confers a valuable right of cross-examining the witness tendered in evidence by the opposite party. The scope of that provision is enlarged by [Section 146](#) of the Evidence Act by allowing a witness to be questioned:

(1) to test his veracity, (2) to discover who he is and what his position in life is, or (3) to shake his credit by injuring his character, although the answer to such questions might tend directly or indirectly to incriminate him or might expose or tend directly or indirectly to expose him to a penalty or forfeiture."

62. This Court, in a judgment reported in [Muddasani Venkata Narsaiah v. Muddasani Sarojana](#), (2016) 12 SCC 288: (2017) 1 SCC (Civ) 268, laid down that the party is obliged to put his case in :::
Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 16 2026:HHC:44344 cross-examination of witnesses of the opposite party. The rule of putting one's version in cross-examination is one of essential justice and not merely a technical one. It was held as under: (SCC pp. 294-95, paras 15-16) .

"15. Moreover, there was no effective cross-examination made on the plaintiff's witnesses with respect to the factum of execution of the sale deed. PW 1 and PW 2 have not been cross-examined as to the factum of execution of the sale deed. The cross-examination is a matter of substance, not of procedure. One is required to put one's own version in the cross-examination of the opponent. The effect of non-cross-examination is that the statement of the witness has not been disputed. The effect of not cross-examining the witnesses has been considered by this Court in *Bhoju Mandal v. Debnath* and *Bhagat*, AIR 1963 SC 1906. This Court repelled a submission on the ground that the same was not put either to the witnesses or suggested before the courts below. A party is required to put his version to the witness. If no such questions are put, the Court would presume that the witness's account has been accepted, as held in [Chuni Lal Dwarka Nath v. Hartford Fire Insurance Co. Ltd.](#), 1957 SCC OnLine P&H 177: AIR 1958 P&H 440.

16. In *Maroti Bansi Teli v. Radhabai*, 1943 SCC OnLine MP 128: AIR 1945 Nag 60, it has been laid down that the matters sworn to by one party in the pleadings, not challenged either in pleadings or cross-examination by another party, must be accepted as fully established. The High Court of Calcutta in [A.E.G. Carapiet v. A.Y. Derderian](#), 1960 SCC OnLine Cal 44: AIR 1961 Cal 359, has laid down that the party is obliged to put his case in the cross-

examination of witnesses of the opposite party. The rule of putting one's version in cross-examination is one of essential justice and not merely a technical one. A Division Bench of the Nagpur High Court, *Kuwarlal Amritlal v. Rekhmal Koduram*, 1949 SCC OnLine MP 35: AIR 1950 Nag 83, has laid down that when attestation is not specifically challenged, and the witness is not cross-examined regarding details of attestation, it is sufficient for

him to say that the document was attested. If the other side wants to challenge that statement, it is their :::
Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 17 2026:HHC:44344 duty, quite apart from raising it in the pleadings, to cross-examine the witness along those lines. A Division Bench of the Patna High Court in Karnidan Sardav.Sailaja Kanta Mitra, 1940 SCC OnLine Pat 288: AIR 1940 Pat 683 .

has laid down that it cannot be too strongly emphasised that the system of administration of justice allows of cross-examination of the opposite party's witnesses for the purpose of testing their evidence, and it must be assumed that when the witnesses were not tested in that way, their evidence is to be ordinarily accepted. In the aforesaid circumstances, the High Court has gravely erred in law in reversing the findings of the first of appellate court as to the factum of execution of the sale deed in favour of the plaintiff."

19. Therefore, learned courts below had rightly accepted rt the complainant's testimony.

20. The accused stated in his statement recorded under [Section 313](#) of the CrPC that he had handed over the cheque to another person, whose name he did not remember, and the person gave the cheque to the complainant. Thus, the accused has not disputed the issuance of the cheque and his signatures on it. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rajesh Jain v.

Ajay Singh, (2023) 10 SCC 148, that where the accused contends that a blank cheque leaf was voluntarily signed and handed over by him to the complainant, it is sufficient to trigger the presumption contained under [Section 118\(a\)](#) and [139](#) of the NI Act. It was observed: -

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 18

2026:HHC:44344

36. Recently, this Court has gone to the extent of holding that presumption takes effect even in a situation where the accused contends that a blank cheque leaf was voluntarily signed and handed over by him to the complainant. [[Bir Singh v. Mukesh](#) .

[Kumar](#) [[Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar](#), (2019) 4 SCC 197: (2019) 2 SCC (Civ) 309: (2019) 2 SCC (Cri) 40]]. Therefore, mere admission of the drawer's signature, without admitting the execution of the entire contents of the cheque, is now sufficient to trigger the presumption.

37. As soon as the complainant discharges the burden to prove of that the instrument, say a cheque, was issued by the accused for discharge of debt, the presumptive device under [Section 139](#) of the Act helps shift the burden on the accused. The effect of the presumption, in that sense, is to transfer the evidential burden rt on the accused of proving that the cheque was not received by the Bank towards the discharge of any liability. Until this evidential burden is discharged by the accused, the presumed fact will have to be taken to be true, without expecting the complainant to do anything further.

21. It was [laid down in Sanjabij Tari v. Kishore S. Borcar](#), 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2069, that where the execution of the cheque is proved or admitted, the presumption would be attracted. It was observed:

"ONCE EXECUTION OF A CHEQUE IS ADMITTED, PRESUMPTIONS UNDER SECTIONS 118 AND 139 OF THE NI ACT ARISE

15. In the present case, the cheque in question has admittedly been signed by the Respondent No. 1-Accused. This Court is of the view that once the execution of the cheque is admitted, the presumption under [Section 118](#) of the NI Act that the cheque in question was drawn for consideration and the presumption under [Section 139](#) of the NI Act that the holder of the cheque received the said cheque in discharge of a legally enforceable debt or liability arise against the accused. It is pertinent to mention that observations to the contrary by a two-Judge :::
Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 19 2026:HHC:44344 Bench in [Krishna Janardhan Bhat v. Dattatraya G. Hegde](#), (2008) 4 SCC 54, have been set aside by a three-Judge Bench in Rangappa(supra).

16. This Court is further of the view that by creating this .

presumption, the law reinforces the reliability of cheques as a mode of payment in commercial transactions.

17. Needless to mention that the presumption contemplated under [Section 139](#) of the NI Act is rebuttable. However, the initial onus of proving that the cheque is not in discharge of any debt or other liability is on the accused/drawer of the cheque [See: [Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar](#), (2019) 4 SCC 197].

of

22. It was [laid down by](#) the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Kuntegowda(supra) that the cheque carries a presumption that it was issued in discharge of the liability for consideration, and the burden is upon the accused to rebut this presumption. It was observed:

5.7.A conjoint and harmonious reading of the aforesaid provisions clearly indicates towards the statutory presumption that every negotiable instrument was made or drawn for consideration and that it was executed for discharge of debt or liability once the execution of the negotiable instrument is either proved or admitted. As soon as the complainant discharges the burden to prove that the instrument was executed by the drawer, the rules of presumption under [Sections 118 and 139](#) of the NI Act help him and shift the burden of rebutting the said presumptions upon the said drawer. Since these presumptions are rebuttable, the accused has the burden of disproving the same by leading evidence, either direct or indirect, to the effect that there did not exist any consideration or debt or that the non-existence of the said debt or consideration is so probable that a prudent man ought to suppose that no consideration or debt existed. However, a bare denial of the passing of any consideration or existence of any debt does not support the defence of the accused and, therefore, to disprove the presumptions, something which is probable has to be brought on record for getting the burden of proof shifted back to the complainant. The accused has to bring on record such facts and circumstances, upon consideration of which the court may either believe that the consideration and the debt did .

not exist or their non-existence was so probable that a prudent man would, under the circumstances of the case, act upon the plea that it did not exist.

23. Therefore, the learned Courts below had rightly held that a presumption would be attracted in the present case that the cheque was issued for consideration to discharge the debt/liability, and the burden would shift upon the accused to rebut the presumption.

rt

24. The accused did not step into the witness box to prove his version. He relied upon his statement recorded under [Section 313](#) CrPC to prove his defence, which is not sufficient. It was held in [Sumeti Viji v. Paramount Tech Fab Industries](#), (2022) 15 SCC 689; 2021 SCC OnLine SC 201 that the accused has to lead defence evidence to rebut the presumption and mere denial in his statement under Section 313 is not sufficient. It was observed at page 700:

"20. That apart, when the complainant exhibited all these documents in support of his complaints and recorded the statement of three witnesses in support thereof, the appellant recorded her statement under Section 313 of the Code but failed to record evidence to disprove or rebut the presumption in support of her defence available under [Section 139](#) of the Act. The statement of the accused recorded under Section 313 of the Code :::
Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 21 2026:HHC:44344 is not substantive evidence of defence, but only an opportunity for the accused to explain the incriminating circumstances appearing in the prosecution's case against the accused. Therefore, there is no evidence to rebut the presumption that the cheques were issued for .

consideration." (Emphasis supplied)"

25. Therefore, the statement of the accused recorded under [Section 313](#) of CrPC was not a legally admissible statement, and the accused cannot derive any advantage from it.

of

26. There was no other evidence to rebut the presumption attached to the cheque and the learned Courts below had rightly held that the presumption was not rebutted.

27. The complainant stated that the cheque was dishonoured with an endorsement 'insufficient funds'. This is duly corroborated by the cheque returning memo (Ext.CW-1/B), wherein the reason for dishonour has been mentioned as 'funds insufficient'. It was [laid down by](#) the Hon'ble Supreme Court in [Mandvi Cooperative Bank Ltd. v. Nimesh B. Thakore](#), (2010) 3 SCC 83; (2010) 1 SCC (Civ) 625; (2010) 2 SCC (Cri) 1; 2010 SCC OnLine SC 155, that the memo issued by the Bank is presumed to be correct and the burden is upon the accused to rebut the presumption. It was observed at page 95:

"24. [Section 146](#), making a major departure from the principles of the [Evidence Act](#), provides that the bank's slip or memo with the official mark showing that the cheque was :::
Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 22

2026:HHC:44344 dishonoured would, by itself, give rise to the presumption of dishonour of the cheque, unless and until that fact was disproved. [Section 147](#) makes the offences punishable under the Act compoundable."

28. In the present case, the accused did not claim that he had sufficient funds in his account, and the cheque was wrongly dishonoured by the bank. Therefore, learned Courts below had rightly held that the cheque was dishonoured, with an endorsement 'funds insufficient'.

29 The complainant asserted that he had served a notice upon the accused. It was suggested to him that the acknowledgement was not signed by the accused. However, the acknowledgement bears the signatures of some person, and the accused never stepped into the witness box to deny his signatures. Therefore, learned Courts below had rightly held that the notice was duly served upon the accused.

30. In any case, it was [laid down in C.C. Allavi Haji vs. Pala Pelly Mohd.](#) 2007(6) SCC 555, that the person who claims that he had not received the notice has to pay the amount within 15 days from the date of the receipt of the summons from the Court and in case of failure to do so, he cannot take advantage of the fact that notice was not received by him. It was observed:

::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 23

2026:HHC:44344 "It is also to be borne in mind that the requirement of giving notice is a clear departure from the rule of Criminal Law, where there is no stipulation of giving notice before filing a complaint. Any drawer who claims that he did not receive the notice sent by .

post can, within 15 days of receipt of summons from the court in respect of the complaint under [Section 138](#) of the Act, make payment of the cheque amount and submit to the Court that he had made payment within 15 days of receipt of summons (by receiving a copy of the complaint with the summons) and, therefore, the complaint is liable to be rejected. A person who does not pay within 15 days of receipt of the summons from the Court, along with the copy of the complaint under [Section 138](#) of the Act, cannot obviously contend of that there was no proper service of notice as required under [Section 138](#), by ignoring the statutory presumption to the contrary under [Section 27](#) of the G.C. Act and [Section 114](#) of the Evidence Act. In our view, any other interpretation of the proviso would defeat the very object of the legislation. As observed in Bhaskaran's case (supra), if the giving of notice in the context of Clause (b) of the proviso was the same as the receipt of notice, a trickster cheque drawer would get the premium to avoid receiving the notice by adopting different strategies and escape from the legal consequences of [Section 138](#) of the Act." (Emphasis supplied)

31. The accused did not claim that he had repaid the money to the complainant, and it was duly proved on record that the accused had failed to repay the amount despite the receipt of the notice.

32. Therefore, it was duly proved on record that the accused had issued a cheque in the complainant's favour to repay the loan taken by him, which was dishonoured with an endorsement 'funds insufficient'. The complainant had issued a notice to the accused which was duly served upon him, and the accused had failed to repay the money. Therefore, all the :::

Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 ::CIS 24 2026:HHC:44344 ingredients of the commission of an offence punishable under [Section 138](#) of the NI Act were duly satisfied and learned Trial .

Court had rightly convicted the accused.

33. Learned appellate Court sentenced the accused to undergo simple imprisonment for 1 month and pay compensation of ₹25,000/- to the complainant. The cheque was issued on 16.06.2010, and the judgment was pronounced by the learned appellate Court on 12.11.2014, after the lapse of more than 4 years. It was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in [Bir Singh v. Mukesh Kumar](#), (2019) 4 SCC 197: (2019) 2 SCC (Cri) 40;

(2019) 2 SCC (Civ) 309: 2019 SCC OnLine SC 138, that the penal provision of [Section 138](#) is deterrent in nature. It was observed at page 203:

"6. The object of [Section 138](#) of the Negotiable Instruments Act is to infuse credibility into negotiable instruments, including cheques, and to encourage and promote the use of negotiable instruments, including cheques, in financial transactions. The penal provision of [Section 138](#) of the Negotiable Instruments Act is intended to be a deterrent to callous issuance of negotiable instruments such as cheques without serious intention to honour the promise implicit in the issuance of the same."

34. Considering the nature of the offence, the sentence of one month cannot be said to be excessive.

35. The cheque was issued on 16.06.2010 for ₹15,000/-.

The sentence was imposed on 10.04.2013, and compensation was .

increased by the learned appellate Court from ₹20,000/- to ₹25,000/- vide judgment dated 12.11.2014, which means that only compensation of ₹10,000/- was awarded to the complainant on the cheque amount of 15,000/-. The complainant lost the of money that he would have gained by investing it. The complainant had to engage an Advocate to prosecute the rt complaint before the learned trial Court. Therefore, he was entitled to be compensated for the loss sustained by him. It was [laid down by](#) the Hon'ble Supreme Court in [Kalamani Tex v. P. Balasubramanian](#), (2021) 5 SCC 283; (2021) 3 SCC (Civ) 25; (2021) 2 SCC (Cri) 555: 2021 SCC OnLine SC 75 that the Courts should uniformly levy a fine up to twice the cheque amount along with simple interest at the rate of 9% per annum. It was observed at page 291: -

19. As regards the claim of compensation raised on behalf of the respondent, we are conscious of the settled principles that the object of Chapter XVII of NIA is not only punitive but also compensatory and restitutive. The provisions of NIA envision a single window for criminal liability for the dishonour of a cheque as well as civil liability for the realisation of the cheque amount. It is also well settled that there needs to be a consistent approach towards awarding compensation, and unless there exist special circumstances, the courts should uniformly levy ::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::CIS 26 2026:HHC:44344 fines up to twice the cheque amount along with simple interest @ 9% p.a. [[R. Vijayan v. Baby](#), (2012) 1 SCC 260, para 20: (2012) 1 SCC (Civ) 79; (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 520]" Considering all these circumstances, the amount of ₹10,000/- as compensation on .

the amount of ₹15,000 after the four years for the loss of interest and the litigation expenses cannot be said to be excessive requiring any interference from this court.

36. Hence, the compensation of ₹25,000/- is not excessive, requiring any interference from this Court.

of

37. No other point was urged.

38. In view of the above, the present revision fails, and it rt is dismissed; so also the pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

39. The record of the learned Courts below be returned with a copy of the judgment.

(Rakesh Kainthla) Judge 09th October, 2026 (Ravinder) ::: Downloaded on - 09/10/2026 22:11:56 :::CIS