

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.366/2022

{ CNR No.TNTU02-003544-2022 }

Vasu (46), S/o.Kandasamy,
No.62A, Sowkathali Pettai,
Tirupathur Town & District

... Complainant

//Vs//

Sathyanathan (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.366/2022. This case came up before me for the final hearing on 17.03.2026 in the presence of Tr.D.Palani, Counsel for the complainant and Tr. T.N. Amudhanandhan, 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

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following.

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 February, 2022 and sought a loan of Rs.10,00,000/- for his urgent business needs and other family necessities. On 10.02.2022 Rs.10,00,000/- (RUPEES TEN LAKHS ONLY) was given as loan by the complainant to the accused who agreed to repay the said amount of Rs.10,00,000/- (RUPEES TEN LAKHS ONLY) within 1 month and received the said amount in cash from the complainant and gave a Karur Vysya Bank Tirupattur Branch cheque bearing number 000140 dated 10.03.2022 for Rs.10,00,000/- (RUPEES TEN LAKHS ONLY) to the Complainant itself. Hence on 17.03.2022 the Complainant deposited the cheque in his bank account maintained in ICICI Bank, Tirupattur branch for collection. However the same was returned on 18.03.2022 as “FUNDS INSUFFICIENT”. The Accused who very well knew that the cheque would be

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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 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 through him. The Assistant Manager, ICICI 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:-

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

PW-1:- The PW-1 is known to the accused for long time. The accused approached PW-1 in the first week of February, 2022 and sought a loan of Rs.10,00,000/- for his urgent business needs and other family necessities. On 10.02.2022 Rs.10,00,000/- (RUPEES TEN LAKHS ONLY) was given as loan by PW-1 to the accused who agreed to repay the said amount of Rs.10,00,000/- (RUPEES TEN 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 000140 dated 10.03.2022 for Rs.10,00,000/-(RUPEES TEN LAKHS ONLY) to the PW1 itself. Hence on 17.03.2022 the PW1 deposited the cheque in his bank account maintained in ICICI Bank, Tirupattur branch for collection. However the same was returned on 18.03.2022 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 PW1. Thereafter the 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 thereafter the PW1 preferred the present complaint against the accused on 11.04.2022 under sections 138 and 142 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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 163713500009617 (Account Name – Sri Annamalaiyar Rice Mill). The bank 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 ICICI Bank Tirupattur Branch who deposed that PW1 deposited the cheque bearing number 000140 in his ICICI bank account bearing number 613601510262 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 were marked. One Anbu was examined as DW-2. No documents were marked.

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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, the accused jointly were engaged in finance business in the name of “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance” which was registered on 22.09.2016. Some problem arose in the said finance business in which the complainant was present 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 each 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.

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

7) Point for Determination:-

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

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 since 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

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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.

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.

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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.
3. About 9 persons including the complainant 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

**STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

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

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 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 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.

**STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

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

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 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

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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. It is pertinent to note that the complainant has been listed as a partner in the Exb.D-1 document. Though the same has been disputed by the complainant side, it clearly shows the name of the complainant as a partner. Even the address of the said complainant in the present complaint and the Exb.D-1 document are one and the same. Hence it can be safely ascertained that the defense side through the Exb.D-1 document has clearly proved that the complainant is also a partner in the said “Lakshmi Saraswathi Finance”.

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 the complainant is another partner in the said partnership firm. DW-1, DW-2 in their cross-examination have stated that 6 cheques each have to be issued as security when

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

they became partners and DW-1 and DW-2 got back their cheques from the complainant when the said partnership firm was dissolved.

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. 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 ben 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

STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026

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

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 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.Vasu
- 2) P.W-2 : Tr. Dinesh, Manager of Karur Vysya Bank
- 3) P.W-3 : Tr. Mugamad Suhel, Assistant Manager of ICICI Bank

**STC 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

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

Complainant side Exhibits:-

- 1) Ex.P-1 : 10.03.2022 dated Original Cheque bearing No.000140 for Rs.10,00,000/-drawn on Karur Vysya Bank Tirupattur Branch - original
- 2) Ex.P-2 : 18.03.2022 dated Return memo - Original
- 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.1637135000009617
- 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 366/2022
Dated 17.03.2026**

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