



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.06.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **M.DHANDAPANI**

Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023
in Crl.A.SR.No.30742 of 2023

Sadurudeen

... Petitioner

Vs.

Rajamanickam

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 378 (4) of Cr.P.C., to grant special leave to the complainant / petitioner to prefer appeal from the order of acquittal passed by the learned District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Kattumannarkoil, Cuddalore District, in C.C.No.175 of 2020 dated 08.05.2023 for the alleged offence under Section 138 Negotiable Instruments Act.

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Chitradevi

For Respondents : No appearance

ORDER

Assailing the order of acquittal passed by the learned District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Kattumannarkoil, Cuddalore District, in C.C.No.175 of 2020 dated 08.05.2023, the present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking leave to file appeal.



2. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner and the respondent were doing leather business for several years. The respondent did not make payments towards the purchase of the leather in the year 2018 and 2019. Thereafter, he promised to make the payment by way of two installments, for which, he had issued 10 cheques for a sum of Rs.50,000/- each for a total sum of Rs.5,00,000/-. However, the said cheque has been deposited by the petitioner and the same was returned by the bankers with an endorsement Payment stopped by the accused. Therefore, the petitioner caused a legal notice to the respondent on 06.06.2020, which was received by the respondent, but no reply and no repayment was made by the respondent. Therefore, the petitioner was constrained to file the complaint.

3. Upon issuance of summons, the respondent appeared and was served with the copies of the documents and as the respondent pleaded not guilty, the court below proceeded with the trial of the case. At the time of trial, on the side of the petitioner, P.W.s 1 and 2 were examined and Exs.P-1 to P-6 were marked. Neither any oral evidence nor any documents were marked by the respondent. On the basis of oral and documentary evidence, the court below found the respondent not guilty of the offence and, accordingly, acquitted the



Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023

respondent, aggrieved by which the present petition has been filed seeking leave to appeal.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the presumption u/s 139 falls heavily on the respondent and the respondent having not rebutted the presumption by placing any material to show the reason as to why the cheque was given, necessarily it has to be held against the respondent. However, without properly appreciating the above, the court below has acquitted the respondent, which deserves interference at the hands of this Court.

5. This Court gave its anxious consideration to the submission advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the materials available on record. Though notice has been served on the respondent, there is no representation on his behalf.

6. It is the consistent ratio of the Courts that grant of leave is not a matter of right; rather it is the edifice on which the liberty of the person, who has been accused of a crime rests and where a person, who had been accused of a crime



had been acquitted by the court below, a presumption follows the golden rule that a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty and on that basis the second presumption on the basis of the acquittal necessitates the appellate court to scrutinize the materials more carefully. Further, grant of leave to prosecute should not be as a matter of routine, but should be on just and equitable basis, when materials reveal that the court below has not appreciated the materials in proper perspective.

7. Grant leave provided for u/s 378 (4) is not an empty formality, but has been brought into the statute only to safeguard the interests of the persons accused of a crime, who have since been acquitted, as otherwise, they would be put through the rigours of continuous litigation even after their innocence has been accepted by the courts below.

8. With the above in mind, a perusal of the materials on record reveal that the entire blank cheques were given to the petitioner from the year 2019 for security purpose with regard to the leather business. The petitioner has not adduced the statement of account details before the trial Court to prove that the respondent has not repaid the balance amount. The petitioner himself admitted



in the complaint that the cheques were collected from the respondent for security purpose from the year Nov-2019. Further, the petitioner has not produced any records with regard to the agreement entered into with the respondent or any person and he has not adduced any evidence that he is doing leather business and even he has not produced his IT returns. In the absence of any proof, the trial Court has rightly rejected the complaint filed by the petitioner, which cannot be interfered with.

9. The court below has premised its finding not merely on technicalities, as has been put forth by the petitioner, but it is more on sound logic. The trial court has doubted the version projected by the petitioner. Further, the petitioner has not established that the cheque was given by the respondent for discharging legally enforceable debt.

10. It is seen that there is no material evidencing the payment of Rs.5,00,000/- as loan to the respondent. Therefore, in the absence of any material to establish the financial capacity of the petitioner and also establish that there is a legally enforceable debt, towards the discharge of which the cheque was issued, which had been returned unpaid, the court below was fully



Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023

justified in rejecting the complaint filed by the petitioner.

WEB COPY

11. As stated above, to grant leave, a case should be made out which bristles with infirmities which strikes at the root of the findings recorded. However, in the case on hand, the petitioner has not made out a case, where the findings are so very perverse that there has been miscarriage of justice warranting this Court to grant leave to set right the wrong that has been committed by the courts below.

12. No infirmities or other materials are placed which necessitates relook into the findings recorded by the courts below and granting leave to appeal would be nothing but a travesty of justice insofar as the respondents are concerned, who have been acquitted through a well considered judgment passed by the court below.

13. In the aforestated circumstances, no case is made out by the petitioner for grant of leave and, accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, the criminal appeal is rejected at the SR stage itself.

19.06.2024



Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non speaking order
rli

To

The District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Kattumannarkoil, Cuddalore
District,



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023

M.DHANDAPANI . J,

rli

Crl.O.P.No.15043 of 2023
in Crl.A.SR.No.30742 of 2023

19.06.2024