

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENNAI

**Present: Thiru.S.Karthikeyan, M.A., M.L., M.Sc., PGDCFSc., PGDDF.,  
Principal Sessions Judge.**

Wednesday, the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2026.

**Crl.M.P.No.4783/2026**

**in**

**C.A.SR.No.5813/2026**

**against**

**S.T.C.No.4055/2024**

(on the file of the XXXV Metropolitan Magistrate (FTC-II), Egmore @ Allikulam,  
Chennai)

M/s. Umarani,  
W/o. Rangarajan,  
Proprietor of Uma Enterprises,  
No.23, Gandhi Street,  
Kannigapuram, Avadi,  
Chennai - 600 054.

...Petitioner / Appellant / Accused

Vs.

M/s. Qute Extrusions (P) Ltd.,  
Rep. by Mr. P. J. Sampath Kumar,  
K.33 N, Phase-II,  
Sipcot Industrial Complex,  
Gumidipoondi - 600 201.

...Respondent / Respondent / Complainant

This petition is coming on 13.07.2026 before this court for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Raja, N. Navamane, E. Ezhilarasu, N. Varsha, L.R. Varshavimanthan, the counsel for the petitioner and of M/s. S. Eshwar, the counsel for the respondent and no objection memo having been filed by the respondent and upon recording the same, this Court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

1. Petition to condone the delay of 38 days in filing the criminal appeal.

2. On perusal of records, it is found that the petitioner herein is the accused in S.T.C.No.4055/2024 on the file of the XXXV Metropolitan Magistrate (FTC-II), Egmore @ Allikulam, Chennai. On 05.03.2026, judgment was pronounced in this case, the petitioner found guilty for the offence punishable u/s.138 of N.I. Act and sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for six months and directed to pay a sum

of Rs.7,78,008/- as compensation to the complainant within 30 days, in default, to undergo two months simple imprisonment. Aggrieved by the said judgment, the petitioner has preferred this present appeal. The said appeal has been preferred with a delay of 38 days. According to the petitioner, the petitioner's mother is suffering from breast cancer and admitted in hospital and also the petitioner has been facing financial difficulties. Hence, she was unable to contact her counsel to file an appeal. Therefore, she prays for condonation of delay.

3. On the other hand the respondent has filed a memo stating that he has no objection to allow the condone delay application. Considering the fact that the petitioner is the accused and she has to file the appeal against the order of conviction and also considering the number of days delay and memo filed by the respondent, this court is inclined to allow the petition.

4. In the result, this petition is allowed.

Dictated to Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, this the 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2026.

**Principal Sessions Judge.**