

BAIL SLIP

The Appellant/Accused namely R.Balashnmugam S/o.Ramasamy was directed to be released on bail as per order dated 29/08/2011 in CrI.MP.1/11 in CrI.RC.No 976 on the file of this Court.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08.02.2018

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

CrI.RC.No.976 of 2011

R.Balashanmugam

.. Petitioner/Appellant/
Accused

Vs.

N.P.Selvam

... Respondent/Respondent/
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Revision has been filed under Section 397 & 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure against the Judgement and conviction dated 21.04.2011 made in C.A.No.157/2010 on the file of Additional District Sessions Judge, (FTC No.I), Erode confirming the Judgement and conviction dated 07.09.2010 made in C.C.No.582/2006 on the file of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Erode.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.S.Saravanan

For Respondent :Mr.I.C.Vasudevan

ORDER

The Criminal Revision has been preferred by the revision petitioner as against the sentence and conviction u/s.138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 against the Judgement and conviction dated 07.09.2010 made in C.C.No.582/2006 on the file of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Erode and confirming the same by the learned Additional District Sessions Judge, (FTC No.I), Erode in 21.04.2011 made in C.A.No.157/2010.

2.Aggrrieved over the findings of the First Appellate Court confirming the judgment of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Erode, awarded under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, sentencing the petitioner to go for one year simple imprisonment

and fine of Rs.2,000/- and if fine not paid one month simple imprisonment, this revision petitioner has preferred this Criminal revision.

3.The brief facts leading to file this Revision Petition as follows:

The revision petitioner had borrowed a sum of Rs.2,11,250/- from the respondent on 26.11.2005 and issued three cheques which have been marked as Ex.P1 to P3 dated 30.11.2005, 26.11.2005, 30.11.2005 respectively for a sum of Rs.71,250/-, Rs.71,250/- and Rs.68,250/-. The cheques were drawn on the account maintained by the accused. When the above cheques were presented for encashment, the same were returned with endorsements "insufficient funds" and the dishonoured memos have been marked as Ex.B4 to B6. The respondent immediately sent a legal notice i.e. Ex.P8 and Ex.P11 is the reply notice.

4.The main contention of the revision petitioner is that there is a material alteration in the cheques. Further, the Trial Court has not given proper opportunities to compare the signature in the cheques. Further, the alleged borrowal has not been established.

5.There is no representation for the respondent. However, this Court perused the materials and dispose of the revision on merits.

6.Though, the contention of the learned counsel is that there are material alterations, on a perusal of the cheques, this Court finds that there are no material alterations. The trial Court has clearly noted that there are no material alterations.

7.It is the further contention of the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner that the trial court has not given any opportunity to compare the signatures found in the cheques. The above contention is also found to be false. In fact, in C.M.P. No.3785/2007, this Court has passed an order appointing Advocate Commissioner and handed over the cheques to the Forensic lab and directed the revision petitioner to take steps to pay the commissioner fee etc., However, the revision petitioner did not evince any interest to avail the opportunity granted by the Trial Court. Therefore, now the contention of the revision petitioner is that he has not given any opportunity, which has no force at all.

8. On a perusal of the entire judgment, the issuance of cheques i.e. Ex.P1 to P3 is not at all denied by the revision petitioner. Even in his reply statement, he has categorically admitted that he has issued blank cheques i.e. Ex.P1 to P3 to the respondent for business transactions. When the issuance of cheques itself for the business transactions is admitted, it is for the revision petitioner to establish why there was no consideration at all.

9. The revision petitioner has failed to produce materials even in the form of probabilities. Therefore, this Court does not find any infirmity in the judgment passed by the First Appellate Court. However, taking into consideration of the amount due by the accused, this Court is inclined to modify the sentence from one year to six months.

10. Accordingly, this revision petition stands dismissed and the Trial Court shall take appropriate steps to secure the accused to serve the remaining period of sentence.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kas

To

1. The Additional District Sessions Judge,
(FTC No.I), Erode

2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Erode.

3. Do Thro The Chief Judicial Magistrate
Erode

4. The Section Officer
Crl. Section High Court, Madras

Crl.RC.No.976 of 2011

nri(co)
aa09/03/2018