



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1620 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

CRL.R.C.Nos.1620 and 1621 of 2024
and Crl.M.P.Nos.13431 and 13433 of 2024

1. M/s. Maximus Crusher
Rep.By Its Partner, Mr.S.Amstrong Fernando
And Mrs.A.Subeka
2. S.Amstrong Fernando
S/o. Sesu Fernando,
Proprietor of M/s. Maximus, Blue Metals
3. A. Subeka
W/o. S. Armstrong Fernando,
One of The Partners in M/s.Maximus Crusher

..Petitioner(s) in
Crl.RC.1620/2024

1.M/s.Maximus Blue Metals
Rep. By its Proprietor
Mr.S.Armstrong Fernando

2.M/s. Maximus Crusher
Rep.By Its Partner, Mr.S.Amstrong Fernando And Mrs.A.Subeka

3.S.Amstrong Fernando
S/o. Sesu Fernando,
Proprietor of M/s. Maximus, Blue Metals

4.A. Subeka
W/o. S. Armstrong Fernando,
One of The Partners in M/s.Maximus Crusher

.. Petitioner(s) in
Crl.RC.1621/2024

Vs.



R.Jayarani (deceased)
Proprietrix of M/s.J2R Enterprises,
Rep.By By Her Legal Heir,
Mr.R.Ashok S/o. K.Raju,
Residing At Flat No.247,
Infinity Apartment,
Sundaresan Nagar,
Vanagaram, Chennai - 600 095.

..Respondent(s) in both
Crl.R.Cs

COMMON PRAYER: Criminal Revision filed under Section 397 & 401 of Cr.P.C., seeking to call for the records related to orders passed in Crl.M.P.Nos.43373 and 43374 of 2024 dated 20.08.2024 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate FTC-II, Egmore Allikulam, Chennai -3 and set aside the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Vinor Paul Tyagaraj David

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Vijayaraghavan

COMMON ORDER

The petitioners / accused, are facing trial in S.T.C.Nos.6697 and 6694 of 2022 respectively, on a private complaints filed by the respondent for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

2.The above Revisions are filed as against the orders passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate FTC-II, Egmore, Allikulam, Chennai-3, in Crl.M.P.Nos.43373 and 43374 of 2024, dated 20.08.2024.

3.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners contended that the above petitions were filed before the Magistrate Court seeking to compare the disputed



signatures found in the Memorandum of Understanding and Memorandum of Compromise and Letter dated 28.02.2019, which were marked as Exs.P2, P3 and P4 respectively, differ from the signature found in Ex.P5, cheque issued by the petitioners. The admitted signature of the petitioner (A2) in Crl.R.C.No.1620 of 2024 is found on the cheque, which has been marked as Ex.P5. Since the respondent / complainant took a contra stand with regard to these documents, the petitioners sought to send the said documents for examination by a handwriting expert. However, the said request was dismissed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate.

4.Learned counsel for the petitioners fairly submits that he did not dispute the signatures in the cheque, which is a subject matter before the trial Court. The trial Court has dismissed the same considering the fact that the petitioners have not disputed the signatures in the documents.

5.Learned counsel for the respondent submits that once the signatures which are found in the documents and cheques are not disputed by the owner of the cheque, it is immaterial to send them for handwriting experts.

6.Therefore, this Court does not find any infirmity or illegality or perversity in the findings of the facts arrived by the Court below, warranting interference.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1620 of 2



N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

KAS

7.In the result, these Criminal Revision Cases stand dismissed as devoid of merits. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

18-08-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

KAS

CRL.R.C.Nos.1620 and 1621 of 2024
and Crl.M.P.Nos.13431 and 13433 of 2024