

**28 CC NI ACT / 7100/2026 Crystal Crop Protection LTD Vs.  
Binit Kumar Rai /0 (Hauz Khas)**

**04.04.2026**

Fresh case received by way of assignment. It be checked and registered.

Present: Ld. Proxy Counsel for the complainant.

At request of Ld. Proxy Counsel for the complainant, be awaited for 12:30 PM for arguments on summoning.

**Jayanti Chander  
JMFC (NI Act)-07/South  
District/Saket Courts/New Delhi  
04.04.2026**

**At 12:30 PM**

Present: Sh. Sunil Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the complainant

Ld. Counsel for the complainant submits that the GST certificate has been placed on record as per which Sh. Binit Kumar Rai is the proprietor of Adarsh Khaad Bhandar.

Perusal of the complaint, evidence by way of affidavit (which is exhibited at this stage as Ex. CW-1/A for the purpose of identification) the documents relied upon by the complainant, shows that they are duly verified and in order. Prima facie, the offence under Section 138 NI Act seems to be committed and I hereby take the cognizance of the same.

The *Hon'ble Supreme Court in the decision reported as A.C. Narayanan vs. State of Maharashtra (2014) 11 SCC 790* has held as under,

“29. From a conjoint reading of Sections 138, 142 and 145 of the N.I. Act as well as Section 200 of the Code, it is clear that it is open to

the Magistrate to issue process on the basis of the contents of the complaint, documents in support thereof and the affidavit submitted by the complainant in support of the complaint....

...33.4 In the light of Section 145 of the NI Act, it is open to the Magistrate to rely upon the verification in the form of affidavit filed by the complainant in support of the complaint under Section 138 of the NI Act and the Magistrate is neither mandatorily obliged to call upon the complainant to remain present before the Court, nor to examine the complainant or his witness upon oath for taking the decision whether or not to issue process on the complaint under Section 138 of the NI Act.”

Similar directions have been issued in *Indian Bank Association & Ors. vs. Union of India (2014) 5 SCC 590* and *Rajesh Agarwal vs. State (2010) 171 DLT 51*.

In view of the aforesaid judgment, the examination of the complainant is dispensed with.

On consideration of the complaint, annexed documents and the verification affidavit of the complainant, this Court is of the opinion that prima facie there are sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused mentioned below for the commission of offence under Section 138, Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

**Let the accused be summoned through all permissible modes on filing of PF within 30 days from today.** In case of non availability/premises found locked/refusal, summons be served by way of affixation.

Complainant is directed to file PF and affidavit (stating that the e-mail ID and mobile number of the accused provided is correct) along with copy of complaint and set of documents, within 30 working days from today. **Ahlmad is directed to issue summons within 03 working days from the date on which PF is filed.**

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 on 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 accused on 30.06.2026.

**Jayanti Chander  
JMFC (NI Act)-07/South  
District/Saket Courts/New Delhi  
04.04.2026**