

27.04.2026

Matter is taken up on VC through Cisco Webex.

Present: Sh. Md. Absar Ahmad, Ld. Counsel for the complainant through VC.

The present complaint has been filed u/s 138 NI Act. The complaint, documents and evidence by way of affidavit perused.

I take cognizance of the said offence.

Arguments heard on summoning. Record perused.

The complainant has filed the complaint within limitation period. In terms of inquiry conducted u/s 202 Cr.P.C., all the statutory requirement have been complied with.

On consideration of the complaint, annexed documents and verification affidavit of the complainant and in the light of the law lay down in *A.C. Narayan Vs. State of Maharashtra* (2014) 11 SCC 790, this court is of the opinion that the prima facie there are sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused for commission of offence u/s. 138 NI Act and accordingly, let summons be issued against the accused through all modes on filing of PF within 15 days through SHO concerned, returnable on the NDOH.

As per the guideline laid down in the case titled *Damodar S. Prabhu Vs. Sayyed Baba Lal H.* reported in (2010) 5 SCC 663, Ahlmad is directed to make a mention in the summons issued 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 cost on the accused”.*

Put up for appearance of the accused, furnishing of bail bonds and framing of notice on **19.09.2026**.

(Sidhant Krishan Singh)  
JMFC (NI Act)-09, South  
Saket Courts, New Delhi/27.04.2026