IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

R/SPECIAL CRIMINAL APPLICATION (QUASHING) NO. 4108 of 2026

With
R/SPECIAL CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 4145 of 2026
With
R/SPECIAL CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 4450 of 2026

FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:

HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE M. K. THAKKER

==========

Approved for Reporting	Yes	No
	YES	

==========

M. BASHIR THRO BASHIALI AKBARALI ASARIYA
Versus
GRIMTECH PROJECTS (I) PVT LTD. & ORS.

==========

Appearance:
MR SP KOTIA(5687) for the Applicant(s) No. 1
MR TUSHAR L SHETH(3920) for the Respondent(s) No. 1,2
MR MEET THAKKAR, ADDL.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the Respondent(s) No. 3

==========

CORAM:**HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE M. K. THAKKER**

Date : 23/10/2026

COMMON JUDGMENT

1. Since the issue raised in the these petitions are similar, they are being decided by a common judgment. The facts of 4108/2026 are taken for the purpose of adjudication.

2. This petition is filed with the following reliefs:

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

> "9...
> A) YOUR LORDSHIP may be pleased to admit this petition.
>
> B) YOUR LORDSHIP may be pleased to quash and set aside the Order passed below Ex.48 by the learned 3rd Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhavnagar in Criminal Case No.7512/2019 on 20.12.2025.
>
> C) Any other and further reliefs, which this Honorable Court deems fit, may kindly be granted in the interest of justice."

3. Heard the learned advocate Mr. S.P.Kotia for the petitioners and learned advocate Mr. Tushar Sheth for the respondent Nos.1 and 2 and Mr. Meet Thakkar, learned APP for the respondent-State.

4. It is submitted by learned advocate Mr. Kotia that the petitioner is the complainant who has filed a complaint against respondent No. 1 in respect of the dishonour of seven cheques. It is submitted that the complainant's evidence was completed and that the petitioner's son was examined below Exhibit 66, during which he referred to documents relating to Commercial Suit No. 13 of 2022, the reply to the notice issued by the accused, and the ledger account of the petitioner's firm. It is submitted that, after referring to the said documents, the petitioner filed an application below Exhibit 48 seeking permission to produce the documents, which are essential for the just decision of the case. However, the said

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

application came to be rejected by the learned Court vide order dated 20.12.2025. It is further submitted that, though the petitioner challenged the said order by filing the present petitions and also filed an application seeking adjournment, the request for adjournment came to be rejected, and the stage of cross-examination of the petitioner's son was closed. Thereafter, upon the petitioner filing an application for reopening the stage of cross-examination, the learned Trial Court proceeded to conclude the cross-examination without awaiting the outcome of the present petitions. It is submitted that the application below Exhibit 48 came to be rejected solely on the ground that the documents were produced after completion of the cross-examination of the complainant and that no satisfactory explanation was provided for their belated production. It is further submitted that the evidence of the prosecution is still in progress and that the said documents were referred to during the examination-in-chief of the petitioner's son. In that background, it is submitted that, having permitted the examination-in-chief of the petitioner's son to be recorded, the learned Trial Court ought to have allowed the application and permitted the petitioner to produce the documents, which are essential for the just decision of the case. Accordingly, it is prayed that the present petitions be

IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Uploaded by () on
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

allowed and the order passed below Exhibit 48 be quashed and set aside.

5. Per contra, learned advocate Mr. Tushar Sheth, appearing for the respondents-accused, submits that the complaint filed by the proprietor of the petitioner firm does not refer to the documents in question. It is submitted that the idea of placing the said documents on record through the evidence of the petitioner's son is an attempt made by learned advocate for the petitioner. It is further submitted that the examination of the complainant was completed more than two years ago, and the petitioner did not produce the said documents during that period. Therefore, the learned Trial Court was justified in rejecting the application on the grounds of delay and the fact that the documents were sought to be produced after the conclusion of the cross-examination of the complainant. In view of the above, it is submitted that no interference is warranted by this Court and that the present petitions deserve to be dismissed.

6. Learned advocate Mr. Sheth, in support of his submissions regarding the power to be exercised under Section 311, has relied upon the decisions rendered by the Apex Court in **Indian Bank**

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

Association and Others v. Union of India and Others, reported in **(2014) 5 SCC 590**, and **Rajaram Prasad Yadav v. State of Bihar and Another,** reported in **(2013) 14 SCC 461.**

7. The present petitions are opposed by the learned APP appearing for the respondent-State.

8. Having considered the submissions made by the learned advocates for the respective parties and the reasons assigned by the learned Court while rejecting the application below Exhibit 48, it appears that the petitioner filed a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, before the learned 3rd Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhavnagar, being Criminal Case No. 7512 of 2019. It was alleged in the complaint that the complainant is the proprietor of a firm and that business transactions had taken place between the complainant and respondent No.1. In connection with the said transactions, the accused had issued seven cheques, each amounting to Rs.10 lakh, which were returned unpaid with the endorsement of “insufficient funds”. It appears that the examination-in-chief and cross-examination of the complainant had been completed. Thereafter, the petitioner’s son was examined below Exhibit 66.

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

9. Learned advocate Mr. Sheth for the respondents raised a contention that the petitioner's son was not included in the list of witnesses permitted to be examined. However, as the respondents did not raise any objection at that stage, this Court finds that the said contention is not relevant for deciding the present petitions, which have been filed challenging the order passed below Exhibit 48. During the examination-in-chief of the petitioner's son, who was examined below Exhibit 66, the following documents were referred to by the said witness:

(i) Commercial Suit No. 13 of 2022;

(ii) Reply dated 19.11.2019 submitted by the accused in response to the notice issued under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881; and

(iii) Ledger account along with bills and a certificate under Section 65B of the Evidence Act.

Admittedly, the evidence of the petitioner's son was recorded below Exhibit 66. Thereafter, an application came to be filed below Exhibit 48 seeking permission to produce the aforesaid documents. Respondent No. 2 objected to the production of the said documents on the ground that they did not form part of the complaint and were being produced from the custody of the complainant. On the basis of the

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

said objections, it was contended that the application deserved to be rejected.

10. The learned Court, while rejecting the said application, observed that the powers under Section 311 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Section 165 of the Evidence Act are not to be exercised for curing omissions or filling up lacuna in the evidence. It was further observed that, in the absence of sufficient cause for the non-production of the documents at the appropriate stage, and considering that the documents appeared to have been within the knowledge and possession of the complainant, the application deserved to be rejected.

11. To examine the reasons assigned by the learned Court, this Court has referred to the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Varsha Garg v. State of Madhya Pradesh and Others**, reported in **2022 LiveLaw (SC) 662**. The relevant portion of the said decision is reproduced hereinbelow:

> "**28**. Having clarified that the bar under Section 301 is inapplicable and that. the appellant is well placed to pursue this appeal, we now examine Section 311 of CrPC. Section 311 provides that the court "may":
>
> (i) Summon any person as a witness or to examine any person in attendance, though not summoned as a witness; and
> (ii) Recall and re-examine any person who has already been examined.

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

This power can be exercised at any stage of any inquiry, trial or other proceeding under the CrPC. The latter part of Section 311 states that the court "shall" summon and examine or recall and re-examine any such person "if his evidence appears to the court to be essential to the just decision of the case". Section 311 contains a power upon the court in broad terms. The statutory provision must be read purposively, to achieve the intent of the statute to aid in the discovery of truth.

29. The first part of the statutory provision which uses the expression "may" postulates that the power can be exercised at any stage of an inquiry, trial or other proceeding. The latter part of the provision mandates the recall of a witness by the court as it uses the expression "shall summon and examine or recall and re-examine any such person if his evidence appears to it to be essential to the just decision of the case". Essentiality of the evidence of the person who is to be examined coupled with the need for the just decision of the case constitute the touchstone which must guide the decision of the court. The first part of the statutory provision is discretionary while the latter part is obligatory.

30. A two-Judge Bench of this Court in Mohanlal Shamji Soni13 while dealing with pari materia provisions of Section 540 of the Criminal Code of Procedure, 1898 observed: (SCC p. 279, para 16)

> "16. The second part of Section 540 as pointed out albeit imposes upon the court an obligation of summoning or recalling and re-examining any witness and the only condition prescribed is that the evidence sought to be obtained must be essential to the just decision of the case. When any party to the proceedings points out the desirability of some evidence being taken, then the court has to exercise its power under this provision either discretionary or mandatory depending on the facts and circumstances of each case, having in view that the most paramount principle underlying this provision is to discover or to obtain proper proof of relevant facts in order to meet the requirements of justice."
>
> Justice S Ratnavel Pandian, speaking for the two judge Bench, noted that the power is couched in the widest possible terms and calls for no limitation, either with regard to the stage at which it can be exercised or the manner of its exercise. It is only circumscribed by the principle that the “evidence to be obtained should appear to the court essential to a just decision of the case by getting at the truth by all lawful means.” In that

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

context the Court observed:

> "18 …Therefore, it should be borne in mind that the aid of the section should be invoked only with the object of discovering relevant facts or obtaining proper proof of such facts for a just decision of the case and it must be used judicially and not capriciously or arbitrarily because any improper or capricious exercise of the power may lead to undesirable results. Further it is incumbent that due care should be taken by the court while exercising the power under this section and it should not be used for filling up the lacuna left by the prosecution or by the defence or to the disadvantage of the accused or to cause serious prejudice to the defence of the accused or to give an unfair advantage to the rival side and further the additional evidence should not be received as a disguise for a retrial or to change the nature of the case against either of the parties."

31 Summing up the position as it obtained from various decisions of this Court, namely Rameshwar Dayal v. State of U.P., State of W.B. v. Tulsidas Mundhra, Jamatraj Kewalji Govani v. State of Maharashtra, Masalti v. State of U.P., Rajeswar Prosad Misra v. State of W.B. and R.B. Mithani v. State of Maharashtra, the Court held:

> "27. The principle of law that emerges from the views expressed by this Court in the above decisions is that the criminal court has ample power to summon any person as a witness or recall and re-examine any such person even if the evidence on both sides is closed and the jurisdiction of the court must obviously be dictated by exigency of the situation, and fair play and good sense appear to be the only safe guides and that only the requirements of justice command the examination of any person which would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case."

32 The power of the court is not constrained by the closure of evidence. Therefore, it is amply clear from the above discussion that the broad powers under Section 311 are to be governed by the requirement of justice. The power must be exercised wherever the court finds that any evidence is essential for the just decision of the case. The statutory provision goes to emphasise that the court is not a hapless bystander in the derailment of justice. Quite to the contrary, the court has a vital role to discharge in ensuring that the cause of discovering truth as an aid in the realization of justice is manifest.

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

33. Section 91 CrPC empowers inter alia any Court to issue summons to a person in whose possession or power a document or thing is believed to be, where it considers the production of the said document or thing necessary or desirable for the purpose of any investigation, inquiry, trial or other proceeding under the CrPC.

34 Section 91 forms part of Chapter VII of CrPC which is titled "Processes to Compel the Production of Things". Chapter XVI of the CrPC titled "Commencement of Proceedings before Magistrates" includes Section 207 which provides for the supply to the accused of a copy of the police report and other documents in any case where the proceeding has been instituted on a police report. Both operate in distinct spheres.

35 In the present case, the application of the prosecution for the production of the decoding registers is relatable to the provisions of Section 91 CrPC. The decoding registers are sought to be produced through the representatives of the cellular companies in whose custody or possession they are found. The decoding registers are a relevant piece of evidence to establish the co-relationship between the location of the accused and the cell phone tower. The reasons which weighed with the High Court and the Trial Court in dismissing the application are extraneous to the power which is conferred under Section 91 on the one hand and Section 311 on the other. The summons to produce a document or other thing under Section 91 can be issued where the Court finds that the production of the document or thing "is necessary or desirable for the purpose of any investigation, trial or other proceeding" under the CrPC. As already noted earlier, the power under Section 311 to summon a witness is conditioned by the requirement that the evidence of the person who is sought to be summoned appears to the Court to be essential to the just decision of the case.

36 PWs 33, 41, 43 and 48, who were the nodal officers of Idea, Airtel, Reliance and Vodafone have already been examined. During the examination of PW-41, the nodal officer of Airtel, the witness specifically deposed during the course of examination that:"2. Call detail of mobile number XXXXXXXXXX, which has 134 pages is Exhibit P-104, I sent the same detail of the call to the police. Each page of the same has seal of Bharti Airtel on the same. Call detail contains date and time wise detail of call and short message services made/sent and received by the customer. Additionally, location of the mobile number is available in code number along with the time of the call or message for which call detail is provided. Location of the call made by the

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

mobile number in certain time has been shown with codes, I cannot state name of the location today by seeing the code. Location can be stated after decoding the same. We have coding chart for location, by seeing the same location can be started. I don't have aforesaid chart along with me. Aforesaid chart is available in the office." (emphasis supplied)

37 The relevance of the decoding register clearly emerges from the above statement of PW-41. Hence, the effort of the prosecution to produce the decoding register which is a crucial and vital piece of evidence ought not to have been obstructed. In terms of the provisions of Section 311, the summoning of the witness for the purpose of producing the decoding register was essential for the just decision of the case.

38 Having dealt with the satisfaction of the requirements of Section 311, we deal with the objection of the respondents that the application should not be allowed as it will lead to filling in the lacunae of the prosecution's case. However, even the said reason cannot be an absolute bar to allowing an application under Section 311.

39. In the decision in Zahira Habibullah Sheikh (5) v. State of Gujarat, which was more recently reiterated in Godrej Pacific Tech. Ltd. v. Computer Joint India Ltd., the Court specifically dealt with this objection and observed that the resultant filling of loopholes on account of allowing an application under Section 311 is merely a subsidiary factor and the Court's determination of the application should only be based on the test of the essentiality of the evidence. It noted that:

> "28. The court is not empowered under the provisions of the Code to compel either the prosecution or the defence to examine any particular witness or witnesses on their side. This must be left to the parties. But in weighing the evidence, the court can take note of the fact that the best available evidence has not been given, and can draw an adverse inference. The court will often have to depend on intercepted allegations made by the parties, or on inconclusive inference from facts elicited in the evidence. In such cases, the court has to act under the second part of the section. Sometimes the examination of witnesses as directed by the court may result in what is thought to be "filling of loopholes". That is purely a subsidiary factor and cannot be taken into account. Whether the new evidence is essential or not must of course depend on the facts of each case, and has to be determined by the Presiding Judge.(emphasis supplied)

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

40 The right of the accused to a fair trial is constitutionally protected under Article 21. However, in Mina Lalita Baruwa (supra), while reiterating Rajendra Prasad (supra), the Court observed that it is the duty of the criminal court to allow the prosecution to correct an error in interest of justice. In Rajendra Prasad (supra), the Court had held that:

> "8. Lacuna in the prosecution must be understood as the inherent weakness or a latent wedge in the matrix of the prosecution case. The advantage of it should normally go to the accused in the trial of the case, but an oversight in the management of the prosecution cannot be treated as irreparable lacuna. No party in a trial can be foreclosed from correcting errors. If proper evidence was not adduced or a relevant material was not brought on record due to any inadvertence, the court should be magnanimous in permitting such mistakes to be rectified. After all, function of the criminal court is administration of criminal justice and not to count errors committed by the parties or to find out and declare who among the parties performed better."(emphasis supplied)In the present case, the importance of the decoding registers was raised in the examination of PW-41. Accordingly, the decoding registers merely being additional documents required to be able to appreciate the existing evidence in form of the call details which are already on record but use codes to signify the location of accused, a crucial detail, which can be decoded only through the decoding registers, the right of the accused to a fair trial is not prejudiced. The production of the decoding registers fits into the requirement of being relevant material which was not brought on record due to inadvertence.

41 Finally, we also briefly deal with the objection of the respondents regarding the stage at which the application under Section 311 was filed. The respondents have placed reliance on Swapan Kumar (supra), a two judge Bench decision of this Court, to argue that the application should not be allowed as it has been made at a belated stage. The Court in Swapan Kumar (supra) observed:

> "11. It is well settled that the power conferred under Section 311 should be invoked by the court only to meet the ends of justice. The power is to be exercised only for strong and valid reasons and it should be exercised with great caution and circumspection. The court has wide power under this Section to even recall witnesses for re-examination or

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

further examination, necessary in the interest of justice, but the same has to be exercised after taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under this provision shall not be exercised if the court is of the view that the application has been filed as an abuse of the process of law."

12. Where the prosecution evidence has been closed long back and the reasons for non-examination of the witness earlier are not satisfactory, the summoning of the witness at belated stage would cause great prejudice to the accused and should not be allowed. Similarly, the court should not encourage the filing of successive applications for recall of a witness under this provision."

In the present appeal, the argument that the application was filed after the closure of the evidence of the prosecution is manifestly erroneous. As already noted above, the closure of the evidence of the prosecution took place after the application for the production of the decoding register and for summoning of the witness under Section 311 was dismissed. Though the dismissal of the application and the closure of the prosecution evidence both took place on 13 November 2021, the application by the prosecution had been filed on 15 March 2021 nearly eight months earlier. As a matter of fact, another witness for the prosecution, Rajesh Kumar Singh, was also released after examination and cross-examination on the same day as recorded in the order dated 13 November 2021 of the trial court.

42 The Court is vested with a broad and wholesome power, in terms of Section 311 of the CrPC, to summon and examine or recall and re-examine any material witness at any stage and the closing of prosecution evidence is not an absolute bar. This Court in Zahira Habibulla H. Sheikh (supra) while dealing with the prayers for adducing additional evidence under Section 391 CrPC at the appellate stage, along with a prayer for examination of witnesses under Section 311 CrPC explained the role of the court, in the following terms:

"43. The courts have to take a participatory role in a trial. They are not expected to be tape recorders to record whatever is being stated by the witnesses. Section 311 of the Code and Section 165 of the Evidence Act confer vast and wide powers on presiding officers of court to elicit all necessary materials by playing an active role in the evidence-collecting process. They have to monitor the

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

proceedings in aid of justice in a manner that something, which is not relevant, is not unnecessarily brought into record. Even if the prosecutor is remiss in some ways, it can control the proceedings effectively so that the ultimate objective i.e. truth is arrived at. This becomes more necessary where the court has reasons to believe that the prosecuting agency or the prosecutor is not acting in the requisite manner. The court cannot afford to be wishfully or pretend to be blissfully ignorant or oblivious to such serious pitfalls or dereliction of duty on the part of the prosecuting agency. The prosecutor who does not act fairly and acts more like a counsel for the defence is a liability to the fair judicial system, and courts could not also play into the hands of such prosecuting agency showing indifference or adopting an attitude of total aloofness."(emphasis supplied)

Further, in Zahira Habibullah Sheikh (5) (supra), the Court reiterated the extent of powers under Section 311 and held that:

"27. The object underlying Section 311 of the Code is that there may not be failure of justice on account of mistake of either party in bringing the valuable evidence on record or leaving ambiguity in the statements of the witnesses examined from either side. The determinative factor is whether it is essential to the just decision of the case. The section is not limited only for the benefit of the accused, and it will not be an improper exercise of the powers of the court to summon a witness under the section merely because the evidence supports the case of the prosecution and not that of the accused. The section is a general section which applies to all proceedings, enquiries and trials under the Code and empowers the Magistrate to issue summons to any witness at any stage of such proceedings, trial or enquiry. In Section 311 the significant expression that occurs is "at any stage of any inquiry or trial or other proceeding under this Code". It is, however, to be borne in mind that whereas the section confers a very wide power on the court on summoning witnesses, the discretion conferred is to be exercised judiciously, as the wider the power the greater is the necessity for application of judicial mind."(emphasis supplied)

43 The Court while reiterating the principle enunciated in Mohanlal Shamji Soni (supra) stressed upon the wide ambit of Section 311 which allows the power to be exercised at any stage and held that:

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

> "44. The power of the court under Section 165 of the Evidence Act is in a way complementary to its power under Section 311 of the Code. The section consists of two parts i.e.: (i) giving a discretion to the court to examine the witness at any stage, and (ii) the mandatory portion which compels the court to examine a witness if his evidence appears to be essential to the just decision of the court. Though the discretion given to the court is very wide, the very width requires a corresponding caution. In Mohanlal v. Union of India this Court has observed, while considering the scope and ambit of Section 311, that the very usage of the words such as, "any court", "at any stage", or "any enquiry or trial or other proceedings", "any person" and "any such person" clearly spells out that the section has expressed in the widest possible terms and do not limit the discretion of the court in any way. However, as noted above, the very width requires a corresponding caution that the discretionary powers should be invoked as the exigencies of justice require and exercised judicially with circumspection and consistently with the provisions of the Code. The second part of the section does not allow any discretion but obligates and binds the court to take necessary steps if the fresh evidence to be obtained is essential to the just decision of the case, "essential" to an active and alert mind and not to one which is bent to abandon or abdicate. Object of the section is to enable the court to arrive at the truth irrespective of the fact that the prosecution or the defence has failed to produce some evidence which is necessary for a just and proper disposal of the case. The power is exercised and the evidence is examined neither to help the prosecution nor the defence, if the court feels that there is necessity to act in terms of Section 311 but only to subserve the cause of justice and public interest. It is done with an object of getting the evidence in aid of a just decision and to uphold the truth. (emphasis supplied)

While reiterating the decisions of this Court in Karnel Singh v. State of M.P.Paras Yadav v. State of Bihar, Ram Bihari Yadav v. State of Bihar and Amar Singh v. Balwinder Singh this Court held that the court may interfere even at the stage of appeal:

> "64. It is no doubt true that the accused persons have been acquitted by the trial court and the acquittal has been upheld, but if the acquittal is unmerited and based on tainted evidence, tailored investigation, unprincipled prosecutor and perfunctory trial and evidence of threatened/terrorised

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

> witnesses, it is no acquittal in the eye of the law and no sanctity or credibility can be attached and given to the so-called findings. It seems to be nothing but a travesty of truth, fraud on the legal process and the resultant decisions of courts coram non judis and non est. There is, therefore, every justification to call for interference in these appeals."

12. The Apex Court, in the aforesaid decision, has held that an application filed under Section 311 of the Code of Criminal Procedure cannot be rejected merely on the ground that allowing the same would result in filling up a lacuna in the prosecution's case. The possibility of certain loopholes being filled as a consequence of allowing such an application is merely a subsidiary factor, and the determination of the application by the Court should be based on the test of the essentiality of the evidence sought to be brought on record. In the present case, the reply to the notice issued under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, which is sought to be produced, is, in the opinion of this Court, an important document for arriving at a just decision in the case. Similarly, the ledger account reflecting the entries relating to the business transactions, along with the bills, would also have a bearing on the complainant's case. Merely because the said documents were not produced earlier or annexed to the complaint, the complainant cannot be precluded from producing them on record. The fact that the documents were referred to during the course of the

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

evidence of the witness cannot, by itself, be considered a substantial ground for rejecting the application.

13. In the opinion of this Court, the essential condition for exercising the powers under Section 311 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is that the evidence sought to be obtained must be essential for the just decision of the case. Where any party to the proceedings points out the desirability of recording certain evidence, the Court is required to exercise the power conferred under the said provision, which may be discretionary or mandatory depending upon the facts and circumstances of the case, to discover or obtain proper proof of the relevant facts in order to meet the ends of justice. The decision relied upon by learned advocate for the respondents pertains to the expeditious disposal of cases under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, this Court is in agreement with the ratio laid down by the Apex Court in that regard. However, at the same time, the Court must bear in mind that justice should not be sacrificed in the pursuit of expeditious disposal. It was contended that proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, are summary in nature and that, in such circumstances, the learned Court ought not to have permitted the examination of a witness

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026

whose name was not included in the list of witnesses. In the opinion of this Court, when the interests of justice demand the examination of a witness to arrive at a just decision and the evidence sought to be produced is essential for such a decision, the Court ought to exercise its powers to permit such evidence to be brought on record.

14. Resultantly, present petitions are allowed. The impugned orders dated 20.12.2025 passed below Exh.48 in Criminal Case No.7512 of 2019, below Exh.44 in Criminal Case No.7515 of 2019, and below Exh.49 in Criminal Case No.7514 of 2019 by the learned 3rd Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhavnagar, are hereby quashed and set aside.

(M. K. THAKKER,J)

M.M.MIRZA

Uploaded by () on
IBC Laws | www.ibclaw.in
Downloaded on : Fri Oct 30 17:11:05 IST 2026