IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH:
AT AMARAVATI
***

Criminal Appeal No.937 of 2017

Between:

Varre Veera Raghavamma, W/o. Nagesh, Hindu, aged about 49 years, Occupation business, R/o.D.No.1-380, Besides CTC Church, Rayudupalem, Kakinada Rural Mandal, East Godavari District.

.... Appellant/Respondent/Complainant

And

1) Devara Surya Satya Ananda Rao, S/o. Narasannarao, Hindu, aged about 64 years, Occ: Retd. ARSI, R/o. Behind CTC Church, Teacher's Colony, Rayudupalem, Kakinada, East Godavari District.

2) Devara Hemavathi, W/o. Surya Satya Ananda Rao, Hindu, aged about 61 years, Occ: House Wife, R/o. Behind CTC Church, Teacher's Colony, Rayudupalem, Kakinada, East Godavari District.

...Respondents/Appellants/Accused

3) The State of Andhra Pradesh, represented through Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

....Respondent

Date of Judgment pronounced on : 14.08.2023.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.MALLIKARJUNA RAO

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgments? : Yes/No
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals: : Yes/No
3. Whether the Lordship wishes to see the fair copy of the Judgment? : Yes/No

_____

JUSTICE T. MALLIKARJUNA RAO

*** THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. MALLIKARJUNA RAO**

+ Criminal Appeal No.937 of 2017

% 14.08.2023

Varre Veera Raghavamma, W/o. Nagesh, Hindu, aged about 49 years, Occupation business, R/o.D.No.1-380, Besides CTC Church, Rayudupalem, Kakinada Rural Mandal, East Godavari District.

.... Appellant/Respondent/Complainant

And

$1) Devara Surya Satya Ananda Rao, S/o. Narasannarao, Hindu, aged about 64 years, Occ: Retd. ARSI, R/o. Behind CTC Church, Teacher's Colony, Rayudupalem, Kakinada, East Godavari District.

2) Devara Hemavathi, W/o. Surya Satya Ananda Rao, Hindu, aged about 61 years, Occ: House Wife, R/o. Behind CTC Church, Teacher's Colony, Rayudupalem, Kakinada, East Godavari District.

...Respondents/Appellants/Accused

3)The State of Andhra Pradesh, represented through Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

....Respondent

! Counsel for the Appellant : Sri A.K. Suresh Reddy.

Counsel for the Respondents/ Accused 1 & 2 : 1) Sri M.V. Suresh.
2) Addl. Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.3.

<Gist :

>Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1) AIR 2000 SC 1833
2) 2008(10) SCC 450
3) A.I.R. 1999 SC 1008
4) 2017(2) ALD Criminal 958 SC
5) 2021 (15) SCALE 184
6) 2022 Latest Caselaw 3827 Guj

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. MALLIKARJUNA RAO

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.937 OF 2017

JUDGMENT:-

1. This Criminal Appeal is filed by the appellant, who was the respondent/complainant in Criminal Appeal No.310 of 2015, on the file of IV Additional Sessions Judge, East Godavari District, Kakinada (for short, "Additional Sessions Judge"), challenging the Judgment, dated 17.07.2017, whereunder the learned Additional Sessions Judge allowed the Criminal Appeal filed by the respondents/accused, setting aside the conviction judgment dated 05.06.2015 in C.C.No.262 of 2014, on the file of V Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate (for short, "the trial Court"), Kakinada, under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, "N.I. Act").

2. The parties to this Criminal Appeal will hereinafter be referred to as described before the trial Court for the sake of convenience.

3. The appellant herein, in the capacity of the complainant before the trial Court filed a complaint under Section 138 of N.I. Act.

4. The case of the complainant is that A.1 and A.2 borrowed Rs.3,00,000/- each from the complainant on 27.03.2011, agreeing to repay the same with interest at 18% per annum, and they executed Ex.P1 and Ex.P2 Promissory notes respectively. On 03.02.2013, A.1 and A.2 issued Ex.P3-Cheque bearing No.401701 for Rs.6,00,000/- towards part payment, drawn on Axis Bank Limited, Kakinada, in

favour of the complainant. On being presented with the Cheque by the complainant, the same was dishonoured and returned with Ex.P4 cheque return memo with an endorsement "payment stopped by the drawer". Later, on 04.03.2013, the complainant got issued Ex.P5 legal notice to the accused, for which the accused gave a reply on 14.03.2013 under Ex.P6, but the accused did not pay any amount and kept quiet. Hence, the complainant filed a complaint against the accused.

5. The learned V Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Kakinada took cognizance under Section 138 of N.I. Act. After the appearance of the accused and after furnishing copies of documents under Section 207 of Cr.P.C., they were examined under Section 251 of Cr.P.C. concerning the allegations in the complainant case, for which they denied the allegations, pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. During the trial on behalf of the complainant, the complainant himself was examined as P.W.1 and marked Exs.P1 to P6. After the closure of complainant's evidence, the accused were examined under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. concerning the incriminating circumstances appearing in the evidence, for which they denied the same and reported defence evidence. A.1 himself was examined as D.W.1 and got marked Exs.D1 to D4 documents to prove their case.

7. The learned V Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Kakinada, convicted the accused 1 and 2 under Section 255(2) Cr.P.C. for the offence under Section 138 of N.I. Act, and they are sentenced to suffer Simple Imprisonment for six months and shall also pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- each, in default, to suffer Simple Imprisonment for one month. Aggrieved by the Judgment, accused 1 and 2 preferred an appeal *vide* Criminal Appeal No.310 of 2015 before the learned IV Additional Sessions Judge, East Godavari, Kakinada, which was allowed by *setting aside* the trial Court judgment. Felt aggrieved, the unsuccessful complainant filed the present Criminal Appeal.

8. Sri A.K. Kishore Reddy, learned counsel representing the appellant, would contend that the learned Additional Sessions Judge ought to have considered that the accused had admitted to a financial transaction with the appellant. Therefore, the learned Judge ought not to have acquitted the accused solely based on the letter sent to the bank to stop payment. He further asserts that the Additional Sessions Judge ought to have taken into account that once the borrowed amount had been repaid by the accused, he should not have had to wait for the return of the promissory notes and cheques from the appellant. As a result, sending a letter to the bank to stop the payment and then issuing a Cheque afterwards indicates malicious intent on the part of the accused. The

observations made by the learned Additional Sessions Judge that the appellant had obtained the promissory notes and the disputed Cheque on the same day are flawed, and acquitting the accused solely on the basis is unlawful.

9. *Per contra,* Sri M.V. Suresh, learned counsel appearing for the respondents/accused 1 & 2, would contend that the learned Additional Sessions Judge correctly acquitted the accused 1 and 2 for the offence under Section 138 of N.I. Act. The reasons given by the learned Judge require no interference.

10. Now, the point that arises for determination is:

> ***Did the learned Additional Sessions Judge commit any error in acquitting the accused 1 and 2 for the offence punishable under section 138 of the N.I Act?***

POINT:

11. The scope of interference in an appeal against Acquittal has been gone into by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaswant Singh v. State of Haryana***[1], wherein it was observed as under:-

> *"21. The principle to be followed by appellate courts considering an appeal against an order of Acquittal is to interfere only when there are compelling and substantial reasons for doing so. If the order is unreasonable, it is a compelling reason for interference (see Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade v. State of Maharashtra 1973CriLJ 1783). The principle was elucidated in Ramesh Babulal Doshi v.State of Gujarat 1996CriLJ2867: While sitting in Judgment over an acquittal, the*

[1] AIR 2000 SC 1833

appellate Court is first required to seek an answer to the question whether the findings of the trial court are palpably wrong, manifestly erroneous or demonstrably unsustainable. If the appellate Court answers the above question in the negative, the order of Acquittal is not to be disturbed. Conversely, if the appellate Court holds, for reasons to be recorded, that the order of Acquittal cannot be sustained given any of the above infirmities, it can then and then only reappraise the evidence to arrive at its own conclusions."

12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Ghurey Lal vs State of U.P.***[2], while referring to the case of ***Sheo Swarup v. King Emperor [AIR 1934 PC 227(2)]*** discussed the ambit and scope of the powers of the appellate Court in dealing with an appeal against Acquittal and observed as under:

"..the High Court should and will always give proper weight and consideration to such matters as (1) the views of the trial Judge as to the credibility of the witnesses, (2) the presumption of innocence in favour of the accused, a presumption certainly not weakened by the fact that he has been acquitted at his trial, (3) the right of the accused to the benefit of any doubt, and (4) the slowness of an appellate court in disturbing a finding of fact arrived at by a Judge who had the advantage of seeing the witnesses.."

The law succinctly crystallized, in this case, has been consistently followed by this Court. On proper analysis of the ratio and findings of this case, it is revealed that the trial court findings are based on the fundamental principles of criminal jurisprudence. The presumption of innocence in favour of the accused is further reinforced and strengthened by the trial court's Acquittal. The appellate Court undoubtedly has wide powers of re-appreciating and re-evaluating the entire evidence. Still, it would be justified to interfere with the

---

[2] 2008(10) SCC 450

Judgment of Acquittal only when the trial court judgment is palpably wrong, totally ill-founded or wholly misconceived, based on erroneous analysis of evidence and non-existent material, demonstrably unsustainable or perverse."

13. In light of the settled above legal position, I now consider the facts of the present case. Section 138 of the N.I. Act provides that a drawer of a cheque is deemed to have committed the offence if the following ingredients are fulfilled:

(i) A cheque drawn for the payment of any amount of money to another person;

(ii) The Cheque is drawn to discharge the "whole or part" of any debt or other liability. "Debt or other liability" means legally enforceable debt or other liability; and

(iii) The Cheque is returned by the bank unpaid because of insufficient funds.

However, unless the stipulations in the proviso are fulfilled, the offence is not deemed to be committed. The conditions in the provision are as follows:

(i) The Cheque must be presented in the bank within three months from the date on which it was drawn or within the period of its validity;

(ii) The holder of the Cheque must make a demand for the payment of the "said amount of money" by giving a notice in writing to the drawer of the Cheque within thirty days from the receipt of the notice from the bank that the Cheque was returned dishonoured; and

(iii) The holder of the Cheque fails to make the payment of the "said amount of money" within fifteen days from the receipt of the notice.

14. The complainant was examined as P.W.1 and got marked Exs.P1 to P6 documents. It is the case of the complainant that A.1 borrowed Rs.3,00,000/- from the complainant and executed Ex.P1-Promissory Note, dated 27.03.2011 and A.2 also borrowed Rs.3,00,000/- from her and executed Ex.P2-Promissory Note.

15. The 1st appellant/A.1 was examined as D.W.1. It is not disputed that A.1 was retired as Assistant Reserve Sub-Inspector. According to his evidence, he and his wife jointly borrowed Rs.50,000/- from the complainant in April 2010 at the interest rate of Rs.10/- per Rs.100/- per month. At the time of the loan transaction, the complainant obtained two blank promissory notes, i.e. one from his wife and another from him and one blank Axis Bank cheque from them, and the said Cheque bearing number is 401701. In the chief examination itself, he deposed that the signatures on Exs.P1, P2, and P3-cheque belong to them. According to D.W.1, Exs.P1 to P3 were obtained by P.W.1 in the blank State from them in April 2010, at the time of the loan transaction, and the complainant filed this complaint by fabricating the said blank promissory notes and a blank cheque. D.W.1 also admitted that P.W.1 got issued a statutory legal notice dated 14.03.2013 [Ex.P5]. After receipt of the legal notice, they got issued Ex.P6-Reply notice dated 14.03.2013. According to the version of D.W.1 that he never issued Ex.P3 cheque to the complainant towards the discharge of legally enforceable debt.

16. Thus, it is not in dispute that the complainant complied with the presentation of the Cheque in the bank for its encashment, the issuance of statutory notice to the accused and the filing of the complaint within the period of limitation.

17. Once the accused have admitted their signatures on the Cheque and handed it over, it means that the person signing it has given implied authority to the holder of the Cheque to fill up the blanks which they have left. Even when issuing a blank cheque, there cannot be an excuse for liability if the other requirements of Section 138 of N.I. Act are proved.

18. In ***Bharat Barrel and Drum Manufacturing Company Vs Ameen Chand Pyarelel[3],*** wherein it is observed that:

> *"Upon consideration of various judgments as noted herein above, the position of law which emerges is that once execution of the promissory note is admitted, the presumption u/Sec.118-A would arise that it is supported by consideration. Such a presumption is rebuttable.*
>
> *It is further held that the burden upon the defendant of proving the non-existence of consideration can be either direct or by bringing on record the preponderance of probability by reference to the circumstances upon which he relies.*
>
> *It is further held that the bare denial of the passing of consideration apparently does not appear to be any defence. Something which is probable has to be brought on record for getting the benefit of shifting the onus of proving to the plaintiff.*

---

[3] A.I.R. 1999 SC 1008

It is further held that it is true that the plaintiff had produced evidence, and the evidence was, in fact, the evidence in rebuttal of the evidence produced by the defendant in the case. Even though it is true that the plaintiff's evidence was not believed yet, the same could not be made the basis for rejecting the claim because the obligation upon the plaintiff to lead evidence to prove his case could not have been insisted upon because the defendant has prima-facie or initially in not discharge his onus of proof by showing directly or probabalizing the existence of non-consideration".

19. It is not in dispute that Ex.P3-Cheque contains the signature of the accused, and the said Cheque was generated from the account of the accused. When once the accused admitted the signatures and on the request made by the accused, the payments were stopped, a presumption would arise that the Cheque was drawn for consideration on the day on which the cheque bore and the Court had to presume that the holder of the Cheque received it, for discharge of any debt or liability.

20. In light of well-settled legal principles, the burden lies on the accused to prove the non-existence of consideration by bringing on record such facts and circumstances, which would lead the Court to believe the non-existence of the consideration. If the accused discharges the onus of proof showing that the existence of consideration was improbable or doubtful and the execution of the promissory note, the onus would be shifted to the complainant. Then he will be obliged to prove the existence of the consideration.

21. In ***Meters and Instruments Private Limited and others vs Kancham Mehta***[4], wherein it is observed that:

> "*18. From the above discussion following aspects emerge:*
>
> *(i) An offence under Section 138 of the Act is primarily a civil wrong. The burden of proof is on the accused in view of presumption under Section 139, but the standard of such proof is "preponderance of probabilities".*

22. P.W.1/Complainant testified that on 03.02.2013, despite her repeated requests, both accused issued a Cheque with No.401701 amounting to Rs.6,00,000/- in her name. The said Cheque was drawn from their joint account at Axis Bank Limited, Kakinada, towards part satisfaction of the amount due covered under Exs.P1 and P2 promissory notes. As already observed, it is not in dispute that Ex.P3-Cheque was issued by the accused. According to the accused's case, they provided the Cheque in April 2010 when they borrowed Rs.50,000/-. To discharge their burden that they hadn't issued a cheque, as the complainant alleges the accused relied on Ex.D4, a Letter from Axis Bank in Kakinada. It is the accused's contention that on their request only, the payments were stopped long back, and the date on Cheque is two years after the stoppage. Ex.D4, the letter from the bank authorities confirms that they accepted the accused's request to stop payment for the Cheque bearing number 401701 on 30.07.2011 itself. Considering this evidence, it becomes highly

---

[4] 2017(2) ALD Criminal 958 SC

unlikely to accept the complainant's statement that the accused issued the disputed Cheque, i.e. Ex.P3, on 03.02.2013.

23. D.W.1 had provided a clear account of the circumstances that led him to make the request to the bank. According to his testimony, he regularly paid interest to the complainant based on the transactions *vide* Exs.P1 and P2. On 11.02.2011, he received retirement benefits totalling Rs.10,00,000/- and more. Out of the retirement benefits, he settled the loan amount owed to the complainant. To substantiate the defence, the accused referred to Ex.D1, an entry dated 11.02.2011 found in the joint passbook of the accused. This entry indicates that Rs.10,06,929/- was available in their bank account. Additionally, Ex.D2, an Entry dated 25.02.2011, shows an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- available in the said joint passbook. Furthermore, Ex.D3, an account copy provided by the Branch Manager, outlines the account details of the accused from 30.04.2010 to 03.02.2015.

24. As per D.W.1's version, he retired from the service on 30.06.2010. Ex.D3 indicates that at the time of transactions detailed in Exs.P1 and P2, Rs.7,83,960/- was available in the bank account. Given this balance, it becomes difficult to accept the complainant's assertion that the accused borrowed Rs.6,00,000/- from her. According to the accused's version mentioned in the reply notice and supported by DW.1's testimony, DW.1 retired from service on

30.06.2010 and received Rs.9,00,000/- from the Government in November 2011. They repaid the borrowed amount of Rs.50,000/- along with the interest that they had taken in April 2010. Subsequent to settling the amounts, the accused requested the complainant to return the promissory notes and a blank cheque. However, she informed them that these documents were misplaced. This led the accused to suspect the complainant's intention and the possibility of these empty documents being misused. Consequently, in July 2011, they informed Axis Bank officials to stop payment on Cheque with number 401701. It's unlikely that the accused's intention in addressing the bank in July 2011 was to issue a cheque in 2013. This makes the complainant's claim that the accused issued the Ex.P3 cheque on 03.02.2013, two years after the execution of Exs.P1 and P2, less plausible. The primary issue raised by the complainant is that the accused didn't provide her with a notice in 2011 when they informed the bank. It's true that no such notice was given to the complainant. The Court's perspective is that if the accused had provided this information to the complainant, the possibility of filling out the blank Cheque in line with the notice's content couldn't be ruled out. The evidence on record firmly establishes that the complainant's account regarding the issuance of the Cheque by the accused on 03.02.2013 is inaccurate.

25. The complainant's position is not centered on the notion that the accused provided her with a signed blank cheque for her to fill in the details as needed. Instead, she asserts that on 03.02.2013, she received a signed cheque for Rs. 6,00,000/- from the accused. The evidence on record unequivocally demonstrates that two years before the purported issuance of the Cheque, the accused had contacted the bank authorities to halt payment. In contrast, the accused's central argument is that the complainant lacks the capacity to lend Rs.6,00,000/-, and moreover, they have no motive to borrow such an amount around the time of Exs.P1 and P2. As previously noted, the available evidence indicates that the accused held more than Rs.7,00,000/- in their account at the time of the promissory note transactions. Ex.D3's account entries reveal that starting from 18.10.2010, an amount exceeding Rs. 7,00,000/- was present in the Savings Bank account of the accused individuals until 03.02.2015. Commonly, Savings Bank accounts offer interest rates ranging from 5% to 6%. It becomes difficult to accept the complainant's argument that in 2011, the accused borrowed Rs. 6,00,000/- from her with an agreement to repay at an interest rate of 18% per annum. In reality, if the accused needed funds, they could have withdrawn the necessary amount from their Savings account to fulfill their needs. It would be unusual for them to resort to borrowing with the stipulation of paying 18% interest per annum.

26. Regarding P.W.1's financial capacity, she mentioned during her cross-examination that they do not possess any house or properties in Kakinada. She currently resides in a rented house. Additionally, she acknowledged that she did not file any suit based on Exs.P1 and P2, the promissory notes. Interestingly, she didn't provide a reason for not filing a suit. She also admitted that the accused individuals had issued stop-payment letters to their bank before 03.02.2013. Notably, during the cross-examination of D.W.1, there was no suggestion made attributing motives for addressing the bank with a stop-payment letter two years before the alleged issuance of the Cheque. This omission indicates that no motives were being assigned to the accused in connection with this action. Given that no such motives were suggested or implied, and there was no cross-examination of D.W.1 in this regard, the Court agrees that the Additional Sessions Judge's observation is valid. This observation holds that the accused's version of events is more credible and plausible.

27. In the cross-examination of P.W.1 also stated that she does not know whether A.1 was retired from service on 30.06.2010 or not. This Court views that when P.W.1 really lent such a huge amount to the accused, she should have made enquiries as to whether the 1st appellant/A.1 was continuing in the service or not. P.W.1 also stated that there is no documentary evidence with her to say that she had an amount of Rs.6,00,000/- on the date of the alleged loan transactions.

She denied the suggestion that A.1 retired from service in the year 2010, he got retirement benefits in the month of January 2011, and he repaid the loan amount in the month of February 2011. Even P.W.1 did not say in her evidence with regard to the date of retirement of A.1. The bank account shows that the accused received more than Rs.7,00,000/- during that period, as contended by him.

28. Upon a thorough examination of P.W.1's evidence, this Court observes that she has not presented either oral or documentary proof to substantiate her ability to lend Rs. 6,00,000/- at the time of the Exs.P1 and P2 transactions. It's notable that if she indeed had lent such an amount under the promissory notes, she would have taken legal action to recover the owed sum. However, there is no explanation provided by the complainant for her decision not to file a suit for the recovery of the amounts from the accused persons. In light of these circumstances, it seems more plausible that since the accused had settled the debt owed to her, she chose not to pursue legal remedies against them in the Civil Court. This interpretation gains credibility given the lack of evidence regarding her lending capacity and the absence of an explanation for not filing a recovery suit.

29. The evidence of P.W.1 shows that A.1 and A.2 are not relatives, they do not belong to her caste, and she does not know when A.1 retired from the service. In the facts of the case, it is difficult to believe the lending of huge amounts to the accused.

30. The available evidence clearly indicates that the accused had no compelling need to borrow the specified amount, considering that they possessed Rs. 7,00,000/- in their bank account at the time of the Exs.P1 and P2 promissory note transactions. The complainant has not provided a satisfactory explanation or demonstrated the source of her income that would enable her to lend such a substantial sum to the accused. The accused have presented substantial evidence before the Court, and based on this, the complainant's assertion that they issued a cheque on 03.02.2013 is proven to be inaccurate. The evidence adduced supports the view that the accused's version is more likely and credible in this context.

31. It is a cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that in an acquittal appeal, if another view is possible, then also the appellate Court cannot substitute its view by reversing the Acquittal into conviction unless the findings of the trial Court are perverse, contrary to the material on record, palpably wrong, manifestly erroneous or demonstrably unsustainable.

32. In a decision reported in ***Mohan @ Srinivas @ Seena @ Tailor Seena vs. State of Karnataka*** [5], the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed the scope of section 378 of the Criminal Procedure Code as under:-

> *"Section 378 Cr.P.C. enables the State to prefer an appeal against an order of Acquittal. Section 384 Cr.P.C. speaks of the powers that*

[5] 2021 (15) SCALE 184

can be exercised by the Appellate Court. When the trial Court renders its decision by acquitting the accused, the presumption of innocence gathers strength before the Appellate Court. Consequently, the onus on the prosecution becomes more burdensome as there is a double presumption of innocence. Certainly, the Court of the first instance has its advantages in delivering its verdict, which is to see the witnesses in person while they depose. The Appellate Court is expected to involve itself in a deeper, studied scrutiny of not only the evidence before it. Still, it is duty bound to satisfy itself whether the decision of the trial Court is both a possible and plausible view. When two views are possible, the one taken by the trial court in a case of Acquittal is to be followed on the touchstone of liberty and the advantage of having seen the witnesses."

33. In a decision reported in ***State of Gujarat vs Thanabhai Ganeshbhai Rajput***[6], it is held that

"It may be noted that as per the settled legal position when two views are possible, the Judgment and order of the Acquittal passed by the trial Court should not be interfered with by the Appellate Court unless for special reasons. The decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the ***State of Rajasthan Vs. Ram Niwas [reported (2010) 15 SCC 463]*** *can be relied on in this regard.*

34. The accused has successfully discharged the initial burden by providing plausible evidence of the issuance of a cheque in the month of April 2010.

35. In the instant case, the appellant has yet to be able to point out how the findings recorded by the learned Additional Sessions Judge

---

[6] 2022 Latest Caselaw 3827 Guj

are perverse, contrary to material on record, palpably wrong, manifestly erroneous or demonstrably unsustainable.

36. Based on the settled legal position and careful examination of the Judgment of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, this Court concurs with the conclusion reached by the appellate Court. Therefore, this Court agrees with the Appellate Court's finding that the disputed Cheque was not given by the accused to discharge any legally enforceable debt due by them.

37. In light of the analysis, the trial Court's conclusion was found to be erroneous, and the appellate Court's Judgment aligns with the settled legal position. The point is accordingly answered in favour of the accused and against the complainant. The finding of the learned Additional Sessions Judge warrants no interference, and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

38. As a result, the Criminal Appeal is ***dismissed*** by confirming the Judgment dated 17.07.2017 in Crl.A.No.310 of 2015 passed by the learned IV Additional Sessions Judge, Kakinada.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE T. MALLIKARJUNA RAO

Dt. 14.08.2023.
MS

Note: LR copy to be marked.
B/o. MS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. MALLIKARJUNA RAO

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.937 OF 2017

Date:14.08.2023

MS