

(2023-3)211 PLR 001

PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT

Before : Justice Arun Monga.

RAMESHWAR DASS – Petitioner

Versus

M/s KAKRALA TRADING CO & Ors – Respondents

CRM-M-28926 of 2014 (O&M)

Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (26 of 1881), [Section 138](#) - Correction of Cheque Numbers - Wrong cheque numbers mentioned in Legal Notice and complaint - Incorrect typing of cheque numbers in the legal notice was a bona fide error that was inadvertently transmitted to the complaint due to sheer oversight - Typographical error - Application to correct the cheque numbers approved - Proceedings to continue based on the corrected cheque numbers - Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (2 of 1974) S. 190. [Para 11]

Cases referred:

1. 2011 (1) DCR 311., *Santosh Arora v. Jai Narain Aggarwal and State*,
2. 2011 (4) BC 262., *Dillip S. Dhanukar, Chairman and Managing Director Indo Biotech Foods limited v. India Equipment Leasing Ltd.*

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, for the petitioner. *Ms. Palak Jain* for *Mr. C.B. Kaushik*, Advocate for the respondents.

Arun Monga, J. (ORAL) - (02.08.2023) - Petitioner/complainant seeks quashing of two orders i.e. first dated 31.07.2012 (Annexure P-4), passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Guhla, dismissing an application for correction/amendment in the complaint; second order dated 11.07.2014 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned revisional court, upholding the first.

2. Briefly outlining the case, petitioner lodged a complaint against respondents No.1 to 3 under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. It was stated that respondents no. 2 and 3 borrowed Rs. 3,10,000/- in cash from the petitioner for business purposes, promising to repay the amount in November 2010. Respondent No.2 issued two cheques, bearing No. 953525 and No. 953526, dated 10.11.2010 and 30.11.2010, respectively, from respondent No.1's account. These cheques, drawn on Oriental Bank of Commerce, Cheeka, were dishonored due to insufficient funds. Respondents No.2 and 3 are partners of respondent No.1, thus responsible for its business dealings. Despite sending a statutory notice, the petitioner's complaints under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act were not

addressed.

3. The petitioner moved an application for correction/amendment in the complaint, acknowledging a typographical error in mentioning the cheque numbers as 933525 and 933526 instead of the correct numbers 953525 and 953526. The petitioner asserted that the mistake was unintentional and sought correction in order to maintain the accuracy of the complaint without altering its nature. However, this application was dismissed by the trial court on 31.07.2012 (Annexure P-4), and the subsequent revision petition met a similar fate on 11.07.2014 (Annexure P-5).

4. The petitioner's contention is based on the accidental typographical error in the cheque numbers. Upon realizing this error, the petitioner promptly sought correction through a court application, which was unfortunately denied by both the trial court and the revision court, as evident from Annexure P-4 and Annexure P-5 respectively.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner argues against the reasoning employed by the lower courts. The courts denied the correction of cheque numbers on the grounds that the same numbers were mentioned in the legal notice and the initial complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. This line of reasoning, according to the learned counsel, incorrectly assumes that the typographical error was deliberate, instead of an inadvertent mistake.

6. Learned counsel asserts that both courts below committed a material irregularity by presuming that the error was intentional. Whereas, the typographical mistake was carried over from the legal notice to the complaint when the complaint was being drafted in the basis of the legal notice. Lack of knowledge qua the same prevented the petitioner from rectifying the error during the trial proceedings until subsequently, when the mistake was acknowledged and sought to be corrected.

7. Learned counsel relies on judgments of Delhi High Court in case "*Santosh Arora v. Jai Narain Aggarwal and State*",¹ [2011 (1) DCR 311] and Madras High Court in case "*Dillip S. Dhanukar, Chairman and Managing Director Indo Biotech Foods limited v. India Equipment Leasing Ltd. and another*".² [2011 (4) BC 262] He states that typo errors, in somewhat similar circumstances, were allowed to be corrected by both high courts, giving cogent reasons.

8. Conversely, the respondents' counsel opposes the petitioner's plea and supports the validity of the impugned orders relying on the reasons given therein.

9. After considering the arguments presented by both sides, it is my considered opinion that the judgments cited by the petitioner's counsel are fully applicable to the current case. I am in respectful agreement with the views expressed therein.

10. Furthermore, in the examination of the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C., there is a candid admission by the accused qua the actual cheques with the corrected numbers. Bank records and trial testimony also support the assertion that the incorrect typing of cheque numbers in the legal notice was a bona fide error that was inadvertently transmitted to the

complaint due to sheer oversight.

11. Based on the aforementioned analysis, it is evident that the cheques' typographical error, which originated from the legal notice, was indeed unintentional. Consequently, both the impugned orders lack a valid basis, cannot be sustained and are hereby set aside. Consequently the application to correct the cheque numbers is approved. The proceedings shall continue based on the corrected cheque numbers, which are already on record before the trial court for further proceedings in the trial. Proceedings shall commence from the same stage when impugned order was passed by learned JMJC.

12. Pending application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

SS -