



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 909 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL RC No. 909 of 2026

and

CRL MP No. 7187 of 2026

K.Priyadharshini

..Petitioner

Vs

S.Kapil Dev Kumar

..Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Revision case filed under section 438 and 442 of BNSS to set aside the order dated 06.03.2026 passed in Crl.MP.No.575/2026 in STC No.3455 of 2025 on the file of XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai and direct the XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai and consequently to send the cheque bearing No.358370 dated 23.12.2024 to the forensic science department for getting opinion regarding the genuineness of signature along with admitted specimen signature of the petitioner.

For Petitioner:

Mr.C.V.Kumar

For Respondent:

Mr.R.Arumugam

ORDER

This Criminal Revision case has been filed to set aside the order dated 06.03.2026 passed in Crl.MP.No.575/2026 in STC No.3455 of 2025 on the file of XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai and direct the XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai and consequently to send the cheque bearing No.358370 dated 23.12.2024 to the Forensic Science Department for getting opinion regarding the genuineness of signature along with admitted



specimen signature of the petitioner.

WEB COPY

2. The present application has been filed to sent the cheque for forensic Science Department for getting opinion regarding genuineness of the signature. The said application was dismissed by the learned Magistrate on 06.03.2026 on the ground that the application was filed at the fag end of the trial and that even according to the memo issued by the accused Bank, there is a reference that signature differs and apart from that the petitioner has not at all sent reply to the notice issued by the Complainant. Aggrieved by the same, the present application has been filed.

3. Heard the counsels on either side.

4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that from the very inception itself, he has been disputing the signature and even at the time of 313 questioning, the petitioner has disputed the signature. In the earlier round also, he has also filed an application for examining himself as witness, but such application was dismissed. Against which the petitioner preferred revision before this Court. This Court has approved the finding rendered by the learned Magistrate that such petition was filed only to protract the proceedings of the trial Court. He further submitted that unless the petition is allowed, he would be put under loss.



5. However the learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the very application has been filed only to drag on the matter. The contours of the revision is very limited, unless the order of the learned Magistrate is palpably perverse and contrary to the available evidence, then only the same can be interfered.

6. In this case, the reason assigned by the learned Magistrate that the filing of the application at the fag end of the trial that too after a long lapse of time, when the case was posted for argument and apart from that, the non issuance of reply to the complainant's notice, according to this Court, are sufficient reason to dismiss this application. Therefore this Court absolutely does not find any palpable error in the present application and as rightly observed by the learned Magistrate, the application has been filed only to protract the proceedings. Hence, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision case is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

22-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SHL



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 909 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN J.

SHL

To:

The XXV Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai

CRL RC No. 909 of 2026
and
CRL MP No. 7187 of 2026

22-04-2026