

**ORDER BELOW EXH. 42.**  
**CNR NO-MHLA15000564-2024**

This application is filed U/sec. 91 of Cr. P. C. for production of calling of information from Sub Registrar Co-operative society Ltd. Chakur about the loan given by Swaraj Finance and the security taken for recovery of loan to the said transaction of the year 2018 to 2019.

2. Accused submits that complainant is having Finance namely Swaraj. In the year 2018 to 2019 Dattatrya Gadade, Harishchandra Hake, Anil Mahalinge, Mahendra Mandumale, Pandit Mandumale and Suraj Gunthe had obtained loan from Swaraj finance of complainant. The said person are know to the accused. Complainant had taken blank cheque of accused for security of loan transaction among said persons and complainant. There is no loan transaction between complainant and accused. Complainant has misused the said blank cheque and filed the false case against the accused. The Sub Registrar Co-operative society Ltd. Chakur is having entire record about the loan transaction made by Swaraj finance of complainant. Therefore, this application is filed for calling the said information.

3. Complainant filed his say on the back side of application. He submitted that, the matter is pending for cross-examination. In order to delay the proceeding this application is filed by accused. Similar application of accused is rejected by this court. Hence, he prayed to reject the application.

4. On perusal of proceeding it appears that, matter is pending for cross-examination of the complainant since 13.11.2025. Accused has not asked any question about the contents of this application to the complainant. Similar application was filed below exh.25 wherein accused has submitted that, complainant is having possession of 15 blank cheque of accused. The same fact is denied by the complainant as per the say below exh.28 of complainant. Prima facie accused admitted that, he had issued 15 blank cheque as a security for loan transaction. If it is so, then accused is required to brought material or specify the material that, the said information is relevant in present case. But, accused has not specified that, how the said information is relevant in the present matter. Hence, application deserves to be rejected.

5. If there is any relevancy of this 15 documents then accused would have an opportunity to examine the witness or call the documents at the time of evidence of accused. But, this premature application is filed by accused. On perusal of proceeding it appears that since 13.11.2025 the matter is pending for cross-examination of the complainant. Accused is not proceeding with the cross-examination. Therefore it appears that, accused is delaying the proceeding. Thus, following order is passed.

### **ORDER**

Application is rejected.

Place : Chakur.  
Date : 10/02/2026.

( V. S. Waghmode )  
Judicial Magistrate F.C., Chakur.