



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **21.11.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED**

CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1045 of 2025

K.Thangavel
S/o. Kamatchi Pillai
No.796-old No. 3/172
4th Cross Street
Radhakrishnan Nagar
Old Ragavendra School Street
Madhurapuri
Thuraiyur
Trichy District.

... Petitioner

vs.

R.Senthil
S/o. D. Rathinavel
No.4/362
North Street
Arumalai Kottai
Ragavambal Puram Post
Papanasam Taluk
Thanjavur - 614019.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records in Crl A No.9/2024 on the file of the Honble 1st Additional District and Sessions Judge, (PCR) Thanjavur,

1/19



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

and to set aside the Judgment dated 28.08.2024 which confirmed the judgment of the learned trial court in STC No.126/2021 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Fast Track Court, Thanjavur dated 28.11.2023.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.B.Kaverimani for
Mr.C.M.Arumugam

For Respondent : Ms.A.Zubaitha Banu for
M/S.Taplaw Office

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case is filed against the judgement of conviction and sentence, dated 28.08.2024, passed in Crl.A.No.9 of 2024, by the learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge, (PCR), Thanjavur, confirming the judgement of conviction and sentence, dated 28.11.2023, passed in STC.No.126 of 2021, by the Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Thanjavur.

2.The facts of the case in a nutshell, led to filing of this Criminal Revision Case and necessary for disposal of the same, are as follows:-



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

WEB COPY

a) The Revision Petitioner is the accused and the Respondent is the Complainant. It is alleged that the Revision Petitioner/ Accused had borrowed a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- from the Respondent/Complainant on 19.08.2018 and to discharge the said debt, the Revision Petitioner/Accused had issued two cheques, bearing Nos.845689 and 845690, dated 23.03.2021 and 14.04.2021 respectively for a sum Rs. 5,00,000/- each drawn on Indian Overseas Bank, Thuraiyur Madhurapuri Branch in favour of the Respondent/Complainant. When the said cheques were presented for encashment on 21.06.2021, the same was returned with the endorsement “Funds Insufficient”. Thereafter, the Respondent/Complainant had issued a notice, dated 16.07.2021, to the Revision Petitioner/Accused and on receipt of such notice, the Revision Petitioner/accused sent a reply, which was received by the Respondent/Complainant on 05.08.2021. Thereafter, the Respondent/Complainant had filed a complaint in STC.No.126 of 2021 before the Trial Court, against the Revision Petitioner/Accused, for the



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, for recovery of the cheque amount.

b) The signature of the Revision Petitioner/Accused on the cheques, bearing Nos.845689 and 845690, dated 23.03.2021 and 14.04.2021 respectively for a sum Rs.5,00,000/- each drawn on Indian Overseas Bank, Thuraiyur Madhurapuri Branch, issued by the Revision Petitioner/Accused, in favour of the Respondent/Complainant towards the discharge of liability to the tune of Rs.10,00,000/- was not denied.

c) After completion of trial, by the impugned judgement of conviction and sentence, the Trial Court, found that the Revision Petitioner/Accused had not denied the issuance of the cheque in question, the signature found in the cheque in question and also dishonour of the same and that as the Revision Petitioner/Accused has not rebutted the presumption under Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, by letting in valid evidence, had convicted and sentenced the Revision Petitioner/Accused for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, to undergo one year simple



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

imprisonment and to pay a compensation of Rs.10,00,000/-, in default, to undergo two months simple imprisonment. The lower appellate court, by its impugned judgement, dated 28.08.2024, by confirming the conviction and sentence, had dismissed the appeal. Hence, this Criminal Revision Case has been filed by the Revision Petitioner/Accused.

3.On 18.11.2025, when the matter came up for consideration, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Heard Mr.G.B.Kaverimani, learned counsel representing Mr.C.M.Arumugam, learned Counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner and Mrs.Rekha, learned Counsel representing Mrs.A.Zubaitha Banu, learned Counsel for M/s.Taplaw Office, appearing for the Respondent.

2.This Criminal Revision Petition has been filed to call for the records and set aside the judgment in Crl.A.No.9 of 2024, dated 28.08.2024 on the file of the 1st Additional District and Sessions Court (PCR), Thanjavur, confirming the judgment passed in S.T.C.No.126 of 2021, dated 28.11.2023 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Fast Track Court at Magisterial Level, Thanjavur, wherein the Revision



Petitioner, was convicted for offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, to undergo simple imprisonment for one year and to pay a compensation of Rs.10,00,000/- within one month, in default, to undergo simple imprisonment for two months.

3.Today, when the matter is being taken up, Mrs.Rekha, learned Counsel representing Ms.A.Zubaitha Banu, learned Counsel for the respondent submits that the Revision Petitioner has not paid any single penny to the Respondent as per the judgment passed by the Trial Court in S.T.C.No.126 of 2021, dated 28.11.2023, which was also confirmed by the Appellate Court, dated 28.08.2024 in C.A.No.9 of 2024.

4.At this juncture, Mr.G.B.Kaverimani learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner submits that the Revision Petitioner is now ready to pay 50% of the compensation amount ie., a sum of Rs.5,00,000/-, out of the total compensation amount of Rs.10,00,000/-, by way of demand draft in favour of the respondent and request this Court to grant two days time to bring a demand draft in favour of the Respondent before this Court.

5.Mrs.Rekha, learned Counsel for the Respondent, submits that she has no objection to the request made by the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner, if the Revision



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

Petitioner brings the demand draft of Rs.5,00,000/- in favour of the Respondent on the next date fixed.

6.Accordingly, as prayed for by the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner, two days and no more time is granted to the Revision Petitioner to pay 50% of the compensation amount, ie., a sum of Rs.5,00,000/-, (Rupees Five Lakh only) out of the total compensation amount of Rs.10,00,000/-, by way of demand draft in favour of the respondent. In this regard, he is directed to produce the demand draft receipt in favour of the respondent for the aforesaid amount on the next date fixed, by way of supplementary affidavit, to show his bonafide.

7.Put up this case “for orders” on 21.11.2025 before the appropriate Bench.”

4.This Court heard Mr.G.B.Kaverimani, learned counsel representing Mr.C.M.Arumugam, learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Accused and Ms.Zubaitha Banu for M/S.Taplaw Office appearing for the Complainant/Respondent and considered their submissions and also perused the entire materials placed on record.



CrI.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

5. According to the Revision Petitioner/Accused, the Respondent/Complainant had no capacity to lend such a huge amount.

There is no proof that there was legally enforceable debt between the parties. Both the courts below have committed errors in not appreciating the evidence in a proper manner and hence, the findings of the courts below are unreasonable and perverse and consequently, the Revision Petitioner/Accused is entitled for acquittal, by allowing this Criminal Revision Case.

6. On the other hand, Ms. Zubaiha Banu for M/S. Taplaw Office appearing for the Complainant/Respondent submits that the cheque amount was not repaid by the Revision Petitioner/Accused. Since the Revision Petitioner/Accused has not denied the issuance of the cheque in question, the signature found on the cheque in question and also dishonour of the same, the impugned judgements of conviction and sentence of the courts below, imposing impugned punishment, are justified and hence, no interference by this Court is required.



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. On perusal of the records, it is seen that before the Trial Court, the Respondent/Complainant was examined as PW.1 and Ex.P1 to P7 were marked, on the side of the Respondent/Complainant. On the side of the Revision Petitioner/Accused, the Revision Petitioner/Accused was examined as DW.1 and no document was marked.

8. It is seen from the records that the matter is one under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and the cheque amount involved in this case is Rs.10,00,000/-. By the detailed impugned judgement of conviction and sentence, the Trial Court had allowed the complaint of the Respondent/Complainant, imposing punishment, as stated above. Thereafter, the Revision Petitioner/Accused had filed the appeal before the lower appellate court and the lower appellate court, by confirming the judgment of the trial Court, dated 28.11.2023, vide judgement, dated 28.08.2024, had dismissed the appeal.



Cr.L.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

9.The main grounds raised by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Accused in the present Criminal Revision Case are relating to only dismissal of the appeal summarily by the lower appellate court. Other than that, this Court finds no other grounds, relating to the merits of the case, put forth by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Accused.

10.The Trial Court had held that the Revision Petitioner/Accused failed to adduce satisfactory evidence to substantiate his defense that the cheques were lost and misused by the Respondent/Complainant.

11.The Trial Court had also further found that once the Revision Petitioner/Accused has not denied the issuance of the cheque in question, the signature found in the cheque in question and also dishonour of the same and since the Respondent/complainant had also proved the execution of the cheque in question, by valid evidence, the presumption under Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act would arise in



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

favour of the Respondent/Complainant, as the Revision Petitioner/accused has failed to rebut the presumption under Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, by letting in valid and convincing evidence.

12. Consequently, the Trial Court had rightly held that the cheque in question was drawn to discharge the legally enforceable debt, as per Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and hence, the Revision Petitioner/Accused was found guilty of the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and accordingly, the Trial Court, by the impugned judgement of conviction and sentence, had rightly convicted and sentenced the Revision Petitioner/Accused for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act to undergo one year Simple Imprisonment and to pay a compensation of Rs.10,00,000/-, in default, to undergo two months simple imprisonment.



Cr.L.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

13. Admittedly, the Revision Petitioner/Accused did not choose to let in any valid and concrete evidence, whatsoever before the Trial Court. Even before this Court, apart from not complying with the earlier orders of this Court, as stated above, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Accused is not able to point out any single piece of evidence, both oral and documentary. But, on the side of the Respondent/Complainant, this Court finds that there are ample evidence in support of the case of the Respondent/Complainant, as discussed by the courts below. The Revision Petitioner/Accused has not denied the issuance of the cheque in question, the signature found on the cheque in question and also dishonour of the same. The Revision Petitioner/Accused failed to rebut the presumption under Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. Thus, this court does not find any error or illegality or perversity in the findings in the impugned judgements of conviction and sentence of the Trial Court, which warrants interference by this Court and accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case, is liable to be dismissed.

12/19



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

14.Further, though it is stated by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Accused that the appeal was dismissed summarily by the lower appellate court, without going into the merits of the case, this Court finds merits in this case in favour of the Respondent/Complainant that the Revision Petitioner/Accused has not denied his signature on the cheques, bearing Nos. bearing Nos.845689 and 845690, dated 23.03.2021 and 14.04.2021 respectively for a sum Rs.5,00,000/- each drawn on Indian Overseas Bank, Thuraiyur Madhurapuri Branch, issued by the Revision Petitioner/Accused, in favour of the Respondent/Complainant towards the discharge of liability to the tune of Rs.10,00,000/-. Further, issuance of the cheque in question and dishonour of the same are also not denied by the Revision Petitioner/Accused.

15.In the case of **Rangappa vs. Sri Mohan, reported in (2010) 11 SCC 441**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that once the accused admits his signature in the cheque, then the presumption comes into play



in favour of the complainant. The relevant portion of the said judgement is extracted as under:-

“15. Coming back to the facts in the present case, we are in agreement with the High Court's view that the accused did not raise a probable defence. As noted earlier, the defence of the loss of a blank cheque was taken up belatedly and the accused had mentioned a different date in the 'stop payment' instructions to his bank. Furthermore, the instructions to 'stop payment' had not even mentioned that the cheque had been lost. A perusal of the trial record also shows that the accused appeared to be aware of the fact that the cheque was with the complainant. Furthermore, the very fact that the accused had failed to reply to the statutory notice under Section 138 of the Act leads to the inference that there was merit in the complainant's version. Apart from not raising a probable defence, the appellant-accused was not able to contest the existence of a legally enforceable debt or liability. The fact that the accused had made regular payments to the complainant in relation to the construction of his house does not preclude the possibility of the complainant having spent his own money for the same purpose. As per the record of the case, there was a slight discrepancy in the



complainant's version, in so far as it was not clear whether the accused had asked for a hand loan to meet the construction-related expenses or whether the complainant had incurred the said expenditure over a period of time. Either way, the complaint discloses the prima facie existence of a legally enforceable debt or liability since the complainant has maintained that his money was used for the construction-expenses. Since the accused did admit that the signature on the cheque was his, the statutory presumption comes into play and the same has not been rebutted even with regard to the materials submitted by the complainant.”

16.In the judgement rendered by the Bombay High Court in the case of **Purushottam Maniklal Gandhi Versus Manohar K. Deshmukh and another, reported in 2007 STPL(DC) 988(BOM); 2007(4) BOMCR404**, it has been held that if a person hands over a duly signed blank cheque, thereby he gives an authority to the holder to put a date of his choice and to present the same for encashment. The cheque does not loose its sanctity merely due to the fact that the same has been filled in by some other person.



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

WEB COPY

17.It is relevant to refer the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **AIR 2019 SC 2446, (Bir Singh Vs Mukesh Kumar)**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the presumption as to legally enforceable debt, the rebuttal of signed blank cheque, if voluntarily presented to payee towards the payment, payee may fill up the amount and other particulars, that itself would not invalidate the cheque. The onus would still be on the accused to prove the cheque was not issued for discharge of debtor liability by adducing evidence.

18.In view of the above said decisions, this Court is of the view that in this case, when the Revision Petitioner/Accused has not denied the issuance of the cheque in question, the signature found in the cheque in question and also dishonour of the same, the presumption under Section 139 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, comes into play in favour of the Respondent/Complainant. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is liable to be dismissed.

16/19



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

WEB COPY

19.Further, the Revision Petitioner/Accused has failed to comply with the conditions imposed by this Court, vide order, dated 18.11.2025, for paying 50% of the compensation amount ie., a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the Complainant/Respondent. This shows that the Revision Petitioner/Accused has no respect to the court orders and he is simply buying time and lingering the matter.

20.In the result, in view of the above said discussions and reasons and in the light of the decisions, referred to above, this Criminal Revision Case is **dismissed**. The impugned judgement of conviction and sentence, dated 28.08.2024, passed in Crl.A.No.9 of 2024, by the learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge, (PCR), Thanjavur, confirming the judgement of conviction and sentence, dated 28.11.2023, passed in STC.No.126 of 2021, by the Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Thanjavur, is **confirmed**. There is no order as to costs. The File is consigned to record.

17/19



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

WEB COPY

21.Let a copy of this order be sent by the Registry to the concerned Trial Court, within two weeks from today, for necessary compliance and information, to be kept in the file of the Trial Court record. The trial Court is directed to proceed in accordance with law.

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No
mm

21.11.2025

To

- 1.The I Additional District and Sessions Judge, (PCR), Thanjavur.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Thanjavur.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

SHAMIM AHMED, J.

mm

Order made in
Crl.R.C(MD)No.1045 of 2025

21.11.2025