



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025
and CrI.M.P.No.24051 of 2025

T.Muthukrishnan

... Petitioner

Vs.

V.Jeyanthi

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita against the order dated 06.11.2025 passed by the FTC IV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, in CrI.M.P.No.5908 of 2025 in STC No.1809 of 2023.

For Petitioner : Mr.Munuraj, G.

For Respondent : Mr.M.Mohammed Nazar

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed to set aside the order dated 06.11.2025 passed by the FTC IV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, in CrI.M.P.No.5908 of 2025 in STC No.1809 of 2023, dismissing the petition filed to summon and examine the Bank Manager,



CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025

Mangudi Branch, Meenakshipuram, Tirunelveli as a defence witness.

WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an accused facing trial in S.T.C.No.1809 of 2023 on the file of the Fast Track Court-IV, Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, for offences under Sections 200 and 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. The petitioner had filed a petition in CrI.M.P.No.5908 of 2025 in STC No.1809 of 2023 before the Trial Court seeking examination of the bank manager, Mangudi Branch, Meenakshipuram, Tirunelveli to prove his case. However, the Trial Court, without considering the necessity of examining the said bank Manager, had dismissed the petition, against which, the present petition has been filed.

3. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondent/complainant would submit that the Trial Court, finding that the petitioner has not stated any reason for examining the witness and that the bank manager of Mangudi Branch, Meenakshipuram, Tirunelveili, is not connected with the accounts, had dismissed the petition. He would further submit that the petition has been filed only at the stage of judgment with a view to protract the trial and the Trial Court rightly held that the petition has been filed only to protract the proceedings and dismissed the petition and



CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025

hence, the impugned order requires no interference.

WEB COPY

4. Heard and perused the materials available on record.

5. The Trial Court had dismissed the petition on the grounds that the petitioner has not stated any proper reason for examining the witness, and that the transaction was between the complainant and the petitioner and not connected to the petitioner's brother and that the petition has been filed at the fag end of the trial when the case had been posted for judgment, only to protract the proceedings,

6. I do not find any infirmity in the impugned order passed by the learned Trial Judge. Hence, this criminal original petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

16.12.2025

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
MRN



CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025

To

The FTC IV Metropolitan Magistrate,
George Town, Chennai



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

(MRN)

CrI.O.P.No.34334 of 2025

16.12.2025