

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.09.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

Crl.OP No.29907 of 2012

& M.P.Nos.1 & 2 of 2012

R.Subramaniam

..Petitioner/Accused

Vs

M/s Forma Finance & Investment
Rep by its Power of Attorney
Sushil Forma

..Respondent/Complainant

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to set aside the order dated 08.10.2012 in Crl.M.P.No.1994 of 2012 in C.C.No.7301/1998 on the file of the VIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, George Town, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.T.Narendiran

For Respondent : No Appearance

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to set aside the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.1994 of 2012 in C.C.No.7301/1998 on the file of the VIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, George Town, Chennai.

2.The respondent has filed a private complaint against the petitioner under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act for dishonour of 4 cheques for a total value of Rs.20,00,000/- on the ground that they were returned for "Insufficient Funds".

3.When the case was posted for examination of the defence witness, the complainant filed a petition under Section 311 of the Criminal Procedure Code to examine further witness. The said petition was opposed by the accused on the ground that it was filed to fill up the lacuna and the proposed witness is not cited as witness in the private complaint. The learned Magistrate has allowed the application. Challenging the same, the present petition is filed by the accused.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the powers under Section 311 of the Criminal Procedure Code have to be exercised very sparingly and when the complainant has not given any reason in the petition, the learned Magistrate ought to have dismissed the petition. Under the guise of the interest of justice, all the applications filed under Section 311 of the Criminal

Procedure Code cannot be allowed.

5.I am not able to agree with the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner for the reason that when PW1 Power Agent of the complainant was cross examined, the accused has raised questions about the transaction and his personal knowledge of the same. Therefore, the complainant took out an application to examine further witnesses, which was, in my considered view, rightly allowed by the learned Magistrate.

6.In that view of the matter, there is no merit in this criminal original petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

-sd/-

Assistant Registrar

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar

pvs

To

The VIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court,
George Town, Chennai.

+1 cc to MR.V.T.NARENDRA Advocate SR.NO. 65268

Crl.OP No.29907 of 2012
& M.P.Nos.1 & 2 of 2012

vg-II[co]
RD 27/10/2017

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY