

**Fresh Criminal Revision**  
**Cr. Rev. No. 567/2023**

**Vandana Bhawsinka Vs. M/s Percision Mould & Dies Pvt. Ltd.**

**11.08.2023**

**Fresh Criminal Revision received by way of allocation. It be checked and registered.**

**Present :** Sh. Rajan Chawla, Ld. Counsel for the revisionist.

The main ground of challenge to the summoning order / impugned order is that the name of the firm of revisionist is wrongly mentioned in Para No. 2 of the notice under Section 138 of the NI Act.

Further, Ld. Counsel for the revisionist has pointed out the authorisation letter given by the respondent to its AR. In this letter also, the name of firm of the revisionist is wrongly mentioned.

However, it is the admitted position that details of the cheque-in-question are correct as mentioned in Para No. 6 of the notice under Section 138 of the NI Act.

It is further submitted that the complaint has been filed against the revisionist and her firm.

It is settled law that the purpose of serving statutory notice is to inform the noticee about the case of the person / party issuing notice and to give specific particulars so that the noticee can identify the transaction for which the notice has been given.

In my considered opinion, mentioning of correct particular of cheque-in-question in the legal demand notice, fulfills the aforementioned legal requirements.

Put up on **28.08.2023** for consideration on notice.

**Rajinder Singh**  
**ASJ-06/NDD/PHC/ND**  
**11.08.2023**

**(R)**