

Delhi High Court

Smt Rama Oberoi vs State Nct Of Delhi And Anr on 3 September, 2025

	\$~60		*	IN THE
HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI	%			Date of Decision:
03.09.2025		+		CRL.M.C. 6228/2025, CRL.M.A.
26360/2025 & CRL.M.A.				26359/2025
		SMT RAMA		
0BEROI			Petitioner
				Through: Mr. Bibek
Tripathi, Advocate.				versus
		STATE NCT OF DELHI AND		
ANR	Respondents		
				Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore
Jha, APP for				
State.				
KATHPALIA				
		CORAM:		JUSTICE GIRISH
		J U D G M E N T (ORAL)		

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 12.06.2025 passed by the learned trial magistrate, whereby the petitioner was summoned to face trial under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

2. After hearing learned counsel for petitioner, I do not find it a fit case to even issue notice.

3. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner/accused that the complaint under Section 138 of the Act was filed premature since according to the statute, the complaint has to be filed after 45 days of the statutory notice. It is also argued that the cheques in question do not bear signatures of the petitioner/accused. Further, it is contended that since the respondent filed civil suit for recovery of the outstanding amount pertaining to same CRL.M.C.6228/2025 Page 1 of 3 pages GIRISH DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, 2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65fffe4afec45569a f3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,CID - 7047638, postalCode=110003, KATHPALIA st=Delhi, b40f80cbd2eee60402c487965ff801e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA Date: 2025.09.03 17:51:12 -07'00' Digitally Signed By:NEETU N NAIR Signing Date:03.09.2025 18:14:44 transaction for which the subject cheques were issued, the complaint case is not maintainable in the eyes of law.

4. It is trite that where both, a civil remedy as well as a criminal remedy for any transaction are available, the aggrieved person can avail both the remedies. What has been filed by the present respondent through civil suit is a civil remedy pertaining to civil liability of the petitioner to pay the outstanding amount. The complaint case filed by the present respondent pertains to criminal liability where despite being served with a statutory notice after dishonour of cheque, the petitioner/accused opted not to pay. The goal of the civil suit is the decree of the suit amount while the goal of the criminal proceedings is imposition of punishment, which can be imprisonment as well. There is no bar on the respondent proceeding with both remedies simultaneously.

5. So far as the complaint being premature, the argument is completely devoid of merit. The period of 45 days under reference is not a lump sum consolidated period; it is 15 days (after service of statutory notice, to pay vide proviso (c) to Section 138 of the Act) plus 30 days (to file complaint under Section 141(1)(b) of the Act). The period of 30 days or 31 days (the provision uses the expression "one month") is akin to the limitation period after arising of cause of action. The cause of action arises if by 15th day of service of the statutory notice, the cheque amount is not paid by the drawer. As submitted by learned counsel for petitioner, the statutory notice, which CRL.M.C.6228/2025 Page 2 of 3 pages GIRISH DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, 2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4afec45 569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca, KATHPALIA postalCode=110003, st=Delhi, serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d1557 0996b40f80cbd2eee60402c487965ff801e26fa , cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA Date: 2025.09.03 17:50:57 -07'00' Digitally Signed By:NEETU N NAIR Signing Date:03.09.2025 18:14:44 was issued in time, was served on the petitioner/accused on 22.09.2022. That being so, the time to make payment of the cheque amount expired on 07.10.2022 and the complaint case could be filed by 06.11.2022. As submitted by learned counsel, the complaint case was filed on 29.10.2022, that is within the prescribed period of limitation to file such complaint.

6. Lastly comes the argument of signatures on the cheques. Both cheques clearly bear in print, name of the present petitioner/accused as drawer/signatory of the cheques. Whether or not those signatures under name of the present petitioner/accused are genuine is a matter of trial. It is trite that the High Court while adjudicating upon a petition under Section 528 BNSS shall not carry out a mini trial.

7. The petition is not just devoid of merit but completely frivolous, so dismissed with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner within two weeks with DHCLSC. The accompanying applications also stand disposed of.

8. Copy of this order be sent to the learned trial court to ensure compliance with regard to the costs.

GIRISH DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, 2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4afec4 5569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,CID - 7047638, KATHPALIA postalCode=110003, st=Delhi, serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d155 70996b40f80cbd2eee60402c487965ff801e2 6fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA Date: 2025.09.03 17:50:40 -07'00' GIRISH KATHPALIA (JUDGE) SEPTEMBER 03, 2025/ry CRL.M.C.6228/2025 Page 3 of 3 pages

Disclaimer: These contents are provided for informational/educational purposes only and are not official court-certified copies. For any legal or official use, please refer to certified records from the concerned court.

By downloading and using these documents, you agree that the platform, its developers, and publishers shall not be held responsible for any loss, claim, or consequence arising from the use of such content.