

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE-II, AT
CHENGALPATTU**

**Present:- Tmt.S. Sahaana, M.A. M.L. M.A.,
Judicial Magistrate - II, Chengalpattu
Monday, the 20th day of April 2026
CrI.M.P.No. 3 of 2024 in CC 291/2020**

1. G.K. Hospitality Solutions,
Represented by its Partner Mr. V. Karunakaran,
Firm Address: No.1, Pillaiyar Koil Street,
Maraimalai Nagar – 603 204.

2. Mr. V. Karunakaran,
s/o. Velusamy,
No.5, Varadharajan Street,
Chitlapakkam,
Chennai – 600064.

... Petitioners/
Accused

/ Versus /

Pranav agency,
Represented by its Manager,
Mr. Prabakar,
s/o. Rajaram,
Firm Address: 339/2A1A Sri Vasudev Nagar,
Athapur,
Guduvancherry

... Respondent/
Complainant.

This Petition is filed U/s. 254(2) of Cr.P.C and coming before me on 20.04.2026 for final hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Chandrasekaran, Advocate for the counsel for the Petitioners and on perusal of records, upon the hearing the arguments on both sides and having stood for consideration till this date. The court made the following.

ORDER

1. The Petitioners/Accused seeking filed this petition under section 254(2) of Cr.P.C seeking the relief to issue summon to the 1. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Urapakkam Branch, Urapakkam and 2. The Branch Manager, Indian Bank, Chitlapakkam Branch, Chitlapakkam along with the bank statements with 2018 to till date.

2. Brief averment of the petition filed by the Petitioners are as follows:-

The Petitioners/ Accused are well acquainted with the facts and circumstance of the case. The Complainant filed a false case as against the Petitioners. On 06.08.2022, the Power agent of the complainant was examined as PW1 and he deposed regarding GST for the said Pranav Agency and Income tax returns, profit and loss accounts and bank statements. The Complainant filed Petitioners in CrI.M.P.No. 3598/2024 to direct the complainant to produce the documents and the same was dismissed. The said Pranav agency was started by Ganesan and Prabakaran and the Petitioners are no way liable to pay any amount. It is necessary that the bank transactions of the complainant's bank account statements of the accused bank account with Indian Bank, Chitlapakkam Branch and the complainant bank account at State bank of India, Urapakkam Branch 's Managers have to examined with relevant documents that is the bank statements from year 2018 to till date. Hence, the Petition.

3. Brief averment of the Counter filed by the Respondent/Complainant:-

The Petitioners filed this Petition to drag on the proceedings and the reasons for the documents were not mentioned. No suggestion was put forth in respect of the rice bags. The Respondent has already submitted the proof of supplying of ric bags in form of bills and receipts. Therefore, it is needless to examine the branch manager of Drawer and drawee bank. Hence, the Petition may be dismissed.

4. Point for determination:

Whether this Application can be allowed or not?

5. Discussion:

The Petitioners counsel contended that it is necessary to examine the Bank managers of accused bank account with Indian Bank, Chitlapakkam Branch and the complainant bank account at State bank of India, Urapakkam Branch for the business transaction between both side parties along with the bank statements from the year 2018 till date. Hence, the Petition.

6. Per contra, the Respondent counsel contended that the reasons were not mentioned and it is filed to drag on the proceedings and already bills/receipts were produced. Hence, the Petition may be dismissed.

7. Heard. Records perused. On perusal of records, it reveals that the Respondent/Complainant filed a 138 NI Act case as against the Petitioners/Accused and the same is pending for defense side evidence. At this juncture, the Petitioners/Accused filed this petition seeking the relief to examine the 1. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Urapakkam Branch, Urapakkam and 2. The Branch Manager, Indian Bank, Chitlapakkam Branch, Chitlapakkam.

8. On going through the records, it reveals that the reasons stated on the Petitioners side that the money transaction between both side parties due to business can be proved through bank statement and examination of the Bank managers of the 1. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Urapakkam Branch, Urapakkam and 2. The Branch Manager, Indian Bank, Chitlapakkam Branch, Chitlapakkam are reasonably acceptable one. Further, it reveals that sufficient opportunity has to given to both side parties to proceed the case and to adjudicate the case in proper perspective. Further, it reveals that it is regarding the money transaction for business till the filing of this case. At this juncture, if the petition is allowed, no prejudice will be caused to both side parties, since the Respondent side has opportunity to cross examine the witnesses, if necessary and warranted and at the same time, if the petition is not allowed, great prejudice will be caused to the Petitioners. Hence, on considering above and in the interest of justice and for the just decision of the case, this Petition is allowed. The Petitioners are allowed to examine Bank Managers 1.

The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Urapakkam Branch, Urapakkam and 2. The Branch Manager, Indain Bank, Chitlapakkam Branch, Chitlapakkam as defense side witnesses and the Bank account statement from 2018 till the filing of the case is to be produced by the witnesses at the time of examination.

9. In the result, this Petition is allowed. No cost.

Dictated to the Typist directly typed by her corrected and pronounced by me on this 20th day of April 2026.

Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Chengalpattu.