

91CC NI ACT/29205/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. SHANKARANAND BASAVARAJ
SANKH
92CC NI ACT/29206/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. KARAN KUMARMAHANTESH
NASHI
93CC NI ACT/29207/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. VIRUPAKSHIBABU MUGALI
94CC NI ACT/29208/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. MUZMMILSIRKAZI
95CC NI ACT/29209/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. JOSEPHVANNATHA CHINNAPPA
96CC NI ACT/29210/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. SYED SHAROOQALI
97CC NI ACT/29211/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. SAURAV PAUL
98CC NI ACT/29212/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. HUMER KHAN
99CC NI ACT/29213/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. RAGHU RAGHU
100CC NI ACT/29214/2026, HERO FINCORP LTD Vs. AKBAR SABSHITHAL

04.08.2026

**Fresh complaint has been received from the Facilitation Centre
by way of e-filing. It be checked and registered.**

Present: Sh Amit Kumar, ld. counsel for complainant.

Arguments on summoning heard.

I have gone through the entire record including the complaint and the documents. It is alleged that accused has executed the ECS Mandate in question in favour of the complainant to discharge his liability. On its presentation the same was dishonoured. Therefore, demand notice was sent to the accused by the complainant. Despite service/ deemed service of said notice, accused has failed to make the payment as per provisions of Negotiable Instruments Act.

Complaint, affidavit of evidence and other annexed documents perused. In terms of inquiry conducted U/s 202 CrPC/225 BNSS, all the statutory requirements have been complied with.

Complaint is filed within the prescribed period of limitation. In my considered opinion, prima facie there is sufficient material available on record to summon the accused.

The counsel for the complainant requests that the pre-summoning may be carried out in the absence of AR of the complainant in terms of the dictum of A C Narayanan judgment. She/ He further submits that dictum of A C Narayanan is also applicable to complaints u/s 138 NI Act.

In the matter of “A. C. Narayanan Vs. State of Maharashtra & Anr.”

(2014) 11 SCC 790, Full Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that "... it is a matter of discretion and the Magistrate is not bound to call upon the complainant to remain present before the court and to examine him upon oath for taking decision whether or not to issue process on the complaint under Section 138 of the N.I.Act. For the purpose of issuing process under Section 200 of the Code, it is open to the Magistrate to rely upon the verification in the form of affidavit filed by the complainant in support of the complaint under Section 138 of the NI Act..”

Complaint, affidavit of evidence and documents considered in light of above cited judgment. In opinion of this Court, there is no need to examine the complainant's evidence for purpose of issuance of process.

In view of the complaint, documents produced and verification in the form of affidavit of evidence, there are sufficient grounds for proceedings further against accused person (s) for offence punishable under Section 138 N.I.Act.

Hence, accused be summoned for offence u/s 25 of Payment and Settlement Act, 2007 read with section 142 NI Act on filing of PF/RC through all permissible modes. In the event the house/ office/ premise is found to be locked/ refusal to accept the service/ any other contingency the process be served through affixation. PF be filed within 15 days.

Matter be taken up now on **16.12.2026**.

As per the guidelines laid down as in the case title as “Damodar S. Prabhu Vs. Sayed Babalal H”, AIR 2010 (SC) 1907, Ahlmad is directed to make a mention on the summons issued against the accused (by adding separate sheet, if required) that “accused can make an application for compounding of the offence at the first and second hearing of the case and if such an application is made, compounding may be allowed by the Court without imposing any costs on the accused.”

Deeksha Sethi
JMFC-08(SW)/New Delhi/04.08.2026