

In the Court of the Judicial Magistrate I, Tirupathur

Present: Tr. K.S.Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.)

Judicial Magistrate I, Tirupathur

Tuesday the 17th day of March 2026

S.T.C. No.365/2022

{ CNR No.TNTU02-003542-2022 }

Jeevanantham,(49), S/o.Kandasamy,

No.45/19, Thiyagi Chidambaranar Street,

Tirupathur Town & District

... Complainant

//Vs//

Sathyathan (50), S/o. Namadevan,

No.17, Near Marriamman Koil,

Venkatesawara Nagar, Thiruvannamalai Main Road,

Tirupathur Town & District

...Accused

This case taken on file on 21.04.2022 as STC. No.365/2022. This case came up before me for the final hearing on 17.03.2025 in the presence of Tr.D.Palani, Counsel for the complainant and Tr. M.Manogaran, Counsel for the accused and on hearing the arguments advanced by either side counsels and on perusal of entire evidence and the documents relied by either side and on available material case records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following.

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

JUDGMENT

1) The Complaint has been filed by the Complainant against the Accused under section 138, 142 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (Hereinafter referred as “NI Act”)

2) The contents of the Complaint in brief is as follows:-

The Complainant is known to the accused for long time. The accused approached the complainant in the first week of January 2022 and sought for a loan for family needs and to expand his business. On 18.02.2022, the complainant gave Rs.9,00,000/- (RUPEES NINE LAKHS ONLY) to the accused and he agreed to repay the said amount of Rs.9,00,000/- (RUPEES NINE LAKHS ONLY) within 1 month received the said amount in cash from the complainant and gave a Karur Vysya Bank Tirupattur Branch cheque bearing number 000133 dated 18.03.2022 for Rs.9,00,000/- (RUPEES NINE LAKHS ONLY) to the Complainant itself. Hence on 18.03.2022 the Complainant deposited the cheque in his bank account maintained in HDFC Bank, Tirupattur branch for collection. However the same was returned on 19.03.2022 as “FUNDS INSUFFICIENT”. The Accused who very well knew that the cheque would be returned as funds insufficient has issued the said cheque in order to cheat the complainant. Thereafter the complainant provided 15 days time to the accused and issued a legal notice dated 23.03.2022 to the accused through his counsel to his

**STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

**SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur**

address. The same were received by the accused on 24.03.2022 and neither paid the cheque amount nor sent any reply. Hence thereafter the complainant preferred the present complaint against the accused on 11.04.2022 under sections 138 and 142 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

3) On receipt of the complaint, sworn statement of the complainant was taken and cognizance was taken and process was issued against the accused along with copy of the complaint under section 204(3) Crpc. On appearance, the accused appeared and was questioned about the substance of accusation made in the complaint. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be put on trial.

4) The Complainant examined himself as PW-1 and Exb.P-1 to Exb.P-4 were marked. The Manager, Karur Vysya Bank, Tirupattur Branch was examined as PW-2 and Exb.P-5,6 were marked. The Manager, HDFC Bank, Tirupattur Branch was examined as PW-3 and no documents were marked. The case of the complainant as could be seen from the evidence of the prosecution side is as follows:-

PW-1:- The PW1 is known to the accused for long time. The accused approached the PW1 in the first week of January and sought for a loan of Rs.9,00,000/- to meet his

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

family expenses and to develop his business. PW-1 on 18.02.2022 gave Rs.9,00,000/- (RUPEES NINE LAKHS ONLY) to the accused who agreed to repay the said amount of Rs.9,00,000/- (RUPEES NINE LAKHS ONLY) within 1 month and received the said amount in cash from the PW1 and gave a Karur Vysya Bank Tirupattur Branch cheque bearing number 000133 dated 18.03.2022 for Rs.9,00,000/- (RUPEES NINE LAKHS ONLY) to the PW1. Hence on 18.03.2022 PW1 deposited the cheque in his bank account maintained in HDFC Bank, Tirupattur branch for collection. However the same was returned on 19.03.2022 as "FUNDS INSUFFICIENT". The Accused who very well knew that the cheque would be returned as funds insufficient has issued the said cheque in order to cheat PW1. Thereafter PW1 provided 15 days time to the accused and issued a legal notice dated 23.03.2022 to the accused through his counsel to his address. The same were received by the accused on 24.03.2022 and neither paid the cheque amount nor sent any reply. Hence PW1 preferred the present complaint against the accused on 11.04.2022 under sections 138 and 142 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

PW2 :- PW-2 is the Manager of Karur Vysya Bank, Tirupattur Branch who deposed that the accused is maintaining account in their branch and his account number is 1637135000009617 (Account Name – Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mill). The bank

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

statement from 01.04.2020 to 06.02.2023 was marked as Exb.P-5. Account details with photo was marked Exb.P-6.

PW3 :- PW-3 is the Manager of HDFC Bank Tirupattur Branch who deposed that PW1 deposited the cheque bearing number 000133 in his HDFC bank account bearing number 20531930000244 for collection. However the same was returned as “FUNDS INSUFFICIENT”.

5) After closing of the evidence on the side of the complainant, the incriminating portion of the complainant side evidence were put forth to the accused under section 313(1)(b) Crpc and the same were denied by the accused as false and further stated that he has evidence to lead on the side of the defence.

6) On the side of the Defense, one Nagaraj was examined as DW-1 and Exb.D-1 was marked. One Anbu was examined as DW-2. No documents were marked.

DW-1 :- DW-1 deposed that the complainant and accused is known to him for 10 years. A total a 9 persons including DW-1, the complainant’s wife Revathi, accused jointly were engaged in finance business in the name of “Lakshmi Saraswathi

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

Finance” which was registered on 22.09.2016. The complainant acted as the Managing Director of the said finance company and was carrying out activities on behalf of his wife. Some problem arose in the said finance business and the same was closed. Exb.D-1 was marked through him.

DW-2 :- DW-2 knows the complainant, accused and DW-1. DW-1, DW-2, Complainant and the accused jointly ran a finance firm as partners in the name and style as “Lakshmi Saraswathi finance” and hence they are known to each other. DW-2 further admitted Exb.D-1 certificate. There were a total of 9 partners in the said firm. The said firm was functioning near Tirupathur Sivaraj lodge. The accounts regarding the same were deposited before the District Registrar every month. At the time of establishment of the finance firm, each partner gave 6 cheques as security. The said firm is not functioning anymore. After that there was problem between Shanmugam, Jeevanandham, Vasu and the accused and hence the cheque given as security was utilized and present case has been filed against the accused.

7) Point for Determination:-

"Whether the Complainant has proved the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt or not?"

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

Discussions:-

8) After hearing rival arguments on both sides and on perusal of the record, it comes to know that the Complainant and Accused are known to each other and they are friends for a long time. Furthermore the accused denied the signature in the cheque at the time of cross-examination. However the accused has not issued any reply notice when he received the legal notice. Furthermore even at the time of first questioning, the accused did not deny the signature found in the cheque. Though the signature was denied by the accused in the cross-examination, the defense side has not taken any steps to send the same for forensic examination. Furthermore it is pertinent to note that the cheque has been dishonoured with the reasons “funds insufficient”. Since the cheque has not been dishonoured for any differences in the signature found in the cheque, mere denial of the signature in the cheque at the time of cross-examination alone will not suffice to prove the case. Furthermore the signature in the cheque has not been denied at the earliest point of time either through a reply notice or at the time of first questioning. Hence it can only be ascertained that the defense side failed to prove that the signature found in the cheque is not that of the accused. Hence it can be ascertained that the signature found in the cheque belongs to the accused.

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

9) The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Rangappa Vs. Sri Mohan reported in 2010 (3) CRIMES 40 (SC), held as follows:-

“ When the signature is admitted by the accused, then the presumption can be drawn in favour of the complainant including the legally enforceable debt and such presumption will be rebuttable in nature”.

10) In the present case also, as per the discussions supra, it has already been decided that the signature found in the Exb.P-1 signature is that of the accused, the initial presumption can be drawn in favour of the complainant. When the initial presumption is available in favour of the complainant, the duty is cast upon the accused to rebut the presumption available in favour of the complainant.

11) In order to rebut the presumption available in favour of the complainant, the Defense side has come forward with the following defenses in the cross-examination and the Defense side evidences.

1. Cheque issued by a company and the said company is not added as a party to the proceedings.
2. There is no transaction between the complainant and the accused and no cheque was issued by the accused to the complainant.

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

3. About 9 persons including the complainant's wife and the accused jointly were running a partnership firm in the name and style as "Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance" and the present cheque was issued by the accused only as a security.

12) **Defense No.1:- Cheque issued by a company and the said company is not added as a party to the proceedings.**

It is the case of the Defense side that the cheque has been issued only by a company in the name and style as "Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi" and hence the cheque was not issued in the individual capacity of the accused and hence the said company is a proper and necessary party to the proceedings. Upon perusal of the Exb.P-1 Cheque, the same has been issued by the Proprietor/Authorised Signatory of "Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi". Hence as per the Exb.P-1 cheque, the same clearly mentions that the said "Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi" is a proprietorship concern and not a company. Specific defense taken by the accused that the said "Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi" is a company and hence a separate entity, the onus of proof is upon the defense side to prove the same. However the defense side has not produced any oral or documentary evidences to show that the said "Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi" was in fact a company and not a proprietorship concern. The Defense side has failed to prove the same. On the contrary, Exb.P-1 cheque clearly mentions

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

that the cheque has been issued by the Proprietor/Authorised Signatory of “Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi”. Thus the Complainant side having clearly established that the said “Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi” is only a proprietorship concern, the said “Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi” is not a separate entity and hence there is no necessity to add the same as a party to the present proceedings in hand. Hence the Defense side has failed to prove that the said “Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mandi” was a company. Thus the Defense side has failed to prove the 1st Defense.

13) Defense Nos.2 and 3 :- There is no transaction between the complainant and the accused and no cheque was issued by the accused to the complainant. About 9 persons including the complainant’s wife and the accused jointly were running a partnership firm in the name and style as “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance” and the present cheque was issued by the accused only as a security.

Specific defense taken by the Defense side that there is no transactions between the complainant and the accused and that the present cheque was only given as security while about 9 persons including the complainant and the accused were running a partnership finance firm in the name and style as “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”. In order to prove the same, the Defense side has examined DW-1 and DW-2 who are

**STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

**SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur**

allegedly partners in the said “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance” partnership firm and marked Exb.D-1. Upon perusal of the said Exb.D-1, the same is the registration certificate of the partnership firm “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”. Upon perusal of the said Exb.D-1 certificate, it can be ascertained that the said DW-1 and DW-2 who are Nagarajan and Anbu are also partners in the said “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”. The Complainant side during cross-examination of DW-1 and DW-2 has not disputed that they are not the partners of the said “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”. Furthermore Exb.D-1 lists the accused N.Sathiyathan also as a partner. Thus the Defense side through Exb.D-1 and the oral evidence of DW-1 and DW-2 has clearly ascertained that DW-1, DW-2 and the accused were partners in the said “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance” partnership firm.

14. It was argued by the learned counsel for the complainant side that the accused, DW-1 and DW-2 were only partners in the said Lakshmi Saraswathi finance and the complainant was never a part of the said partnership firm and hence the stand taken by the defense side that the present cheque was given only as security to the complainant for being a partner of the said Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance does not hold much water. However it is pertinent to note that DW-1 has clearly deposed that the wife of the complainant namely Mrs.Revathi is a partner in the said firm. Upon

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

perusal of the Exb.D-1, it is listed one Mrs.Revathi as a partner. Furthermore the complainant side has neither denied the same at the later point of cross-examination of DW-2 nor has produced any oral or documentary evidences to show that the said Revathi was not the wife of the complainant. While that being so, it can safely be ascertained that the defense side has clearly established that the said Mrs.Revathi, one of the partners of “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance” was indeed a partner in the said firm who is the wife of the complainant.

15. It is the case of the Defense side that cheque was given by the accused to the complainant as security for being a partner in “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”. In order to prove the same, the Defense side examined DW-1 and DW-2 who are the partners in the said firm. As per the discussions supra, it has already been proved by the defense side that DW-1 and DW-2 are indeed partners in “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”. Similarly it has already been proved by the Defense side that Mrs.Revathi, who is another partner in the said partnership firm is the wife of the complainant herein. DW-2 has stated that 6 cheques each have to be issued as security and DW-2 got back his cheques when the said partnership firm was dissolved.

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

16. Though the Defense side has not issued any reply notice immediately after receipt of the legal notice from the complainant, they have consistently taken a view that the present cheque was given only as security for the partnership firm run by him along with complainant and others. The evidences of DW-1 and DW-2 clearly show that cheques were given by all the partners to the complainant, who is the husband of another partner namely Mrs.Revathi. Thus the Defense side have raised a probable defense through the evidences of DW-1 and DW-2 that the cheques could have been given as security for being a partner in the partnership firm. Hence the Defense side having raised a probable defense, the onus of proof shifts back to the complainant to prove the existence of a legally enforceable debt. The Complainant has not produced any oral or documentary evidences to show that there was a legally enforceable debt pending from the accused to the complainant. The Complainant side has not produced any shred of documentary evidences to show that any money transactions between the complainant and the accused at any point of time. It is pertinent to note that the amount alleged to have been given as loan is Rs.9,00,000/-. Hence the Defense side is duty bound to produce any documentary evidences to show the existence of legally enforceable debt or of any transactions between the complainant and the defense side and to show that he in fact was in possession of the said amount on the date of giving it as loan. However the complainant side has not produced any oral or documentary

STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur

evidences towards the same. Hence the complainant side having failed to prove the existence of a legally enforceable debt, the complainant side has failed to establish the guilt of the accused under section 138 of the negotiable instruments act.

17) In the result, the Accused is found not guilty under section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and the accused is acquitted under section 255(1) Crpc.

Dictated to the Steno-typist, transcribed and typed by her on computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on 17th day of March 2026.

**SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur.**

Appendix

Complainant side Witnesses:-

- 1) P.W-1 : Tr. Jeevanantham
- 2) P.W-2 : Tr. Dinesh, Manager of Karur Vysya Bank
- 3) P.W-3 : Tr. Kumar, Manager of HDFC Bank

Complainant side Exhibits:-

- 1) Ex.P-1 : 18.03.2022 dated Original Cheque bearing No.000133 for Rs.9,00,000/-drawn on Karur Vysya Bank Tirupattur Branch - original
- 2) Ex.P-2 : 19.03.2022 dated Return memo - Original

**STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

**SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur**

- 3) Ex.P-3 : 23.03.2022 office copy of the lawyer notice.
- 4) Ex.P-4 : 24.03.2022 Received Acknowledgment card of the accused
- Ex.P-5 : 01.04.2020 to 06.02.2023 bank statment of the account No.163713500009617
- 5) Ex.P-6 : Account details of the accused (Account Name – Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mill)

Accused side Witnesses :-

- 1) D.W-1 : Tr. Nagaraj
- 2) D.W-2 : Tr. Anbu

Accused side Exhibits:-

- 1) Ex.D-1 : Registered certificate of Lakshmi Saraswathi finance

Note:-

- 1) No witness was detained for more than three days without examination
- 2) The case result communicated to parties.

**SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur.**

**STC 365/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

**SD/- K.S. Dinesh, B.A., B.L., (Hons.),
Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Tirupathur**