



2026:TSHC:15766

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

TUESDAY, THE FIFTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J SREENIVAS RAO

CRLP.Nos.2809, 957, 981, 1620, 2608, 2818, 2853, 2856, 2857, 2917, 2928, 2944, 3028, 3029, 3074, 3142, 3143, 3144, 3145, 3206, 3426, 3433, 3587, 3921, 4024, 4027, 4058, 4145, 4249, 4250, 4255, 4256, 4257, 4259, 4260, 4261, 4316, 4361, 4383, 4482, 4483, 4485, 4486, 4558, 4559, 4624, 4660, 4662, 4781, 5194, 5220, 5252, 5505, 5986, 6057, 6251, 6385 AND 6863 OF 2026

CRLP NO: 2809 OF 2026

Between:

Kasam Sathvik, S/o. Kasam Jagan, aged about 25 years, Occ Managing Director, M/s. Chamundeswari Agro Industries Pvt. Ltd., R/o. H. No. 1-4-80, Alankar Road, Beside Canara Bank, Ward-9, Suryapet, Suryapet District, Telangana -508213.

...Petitioner.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad, through Kethapally Police Station, Nalgonda District, Telangana.
2. Mr. B. Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Nalgonda District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No. 32 of 2026 dated 23.02.2026, registered with Kethapally Police Station, Nalgonda District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in pursuant to the registration of FIR No.32 of 2026, dated 23.02.2026, registered with Kethapally Police Station, Nalgonda District, including the investigation, arrest and any coercive actions against the Petitioner.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Mr. B. Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Nalgonda District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2. IN CrI.P.No.2809/2026.

And



2026:YSHC:15766

1. Kasam Sathvik, S/o. Kasam Jagan, aged about 25 years, Occ Managing Director, M/s. Chamundeswari Agro Industries Pvt. Ltd., R/o. H. No. 1-4-80, Alankar Road, Beside Canara Bank, Ward-9, Suryapet, Suryapet District, Telangana -508213.

..Respondent/Petitioner in CrI.P.No.2809/2026.

2. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad, through Kethapally Police Station, Nalogonda District, Telangana

..Respondents/Respondent No.1 in CrI.P.No.2809/2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacated the interim order passed in CrI.P.No.2809/2026, dismiss the Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Sannapaneni Lohit, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for the Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 957 OF 2026

Between:

Ch.Ravi Kanth, Proprietor of M/s. 3RS Food Products (Rudra Rice Mill), Occ- Rice Mill, S/o.Ramesh, Age. 30 years, R/o.D.No.4-3, Hanuman Temple, Damerakunta Village, Kataram Mandal, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District - 505 503.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.

..Respondent.

2. Sri S.Rabhavender, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supply Corporation, J.S. Bhupalpally Jayashankar Bhupalpally District.

...Respondent/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Quash in FIR No.95 of 2024 On the File of P.S Kataram, Bhupalpally District in the interest of justice.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings, in FIR No. 95 of 2024 On the File of P.S Kataram, Bhupalpally District.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Buchi Babu, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing on behalf of the Respondent No.2.



2026:TSHC:15766

CRLP NO: 981 OF 2026

Between:

Smt. Kottam Veena @ K.Veena, W/o Kottam Vamshidhar Reddy, Aged about 34 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s. Kottam Industries (Mill Code. 43201), R/o H.No. 2-24, Sankireddypally Village, Kothakota Mandal, Wanaparthy District, Telangana 509381.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Kothakota, Wanaparthy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Kothakota, Wanaparthy District, Telangana.
3. The Assistant Manager (Gen), Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Wanaparthy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.25 of 2026 dated 27.01.2026 on the file of the Police Station Kothakota, Wanaparthy District and Quash the same against the Petitioner Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.25 of 2026 dated 27.01.2026 on the file of Police Station Kothakota, Wanaparthy District.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

The Assistant Manager (Gen), Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Wanaparthy District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent NO.3.

And

1. Smt. Kottam Veena @ K.Veena, W/o Kottam Vamshidhar Reddy, Aged about 34 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s. Kottam Industries (Mill Code. 43201), R/o H.No. 2-24, Sankireddypally Village, Kothakota Mandal, Wanaparthy District, Telangana 509381.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Kothakota, Wanaparthy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Kothakota, Wanaparthy District, Telangana.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

..Respondents.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacated the interim orders dated 02/03/2026 in CrI.P.No.981 of 2026. 2026:FSHC:15766

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHARGAVAKRISHNA.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 1620 OF 2026

Between:

Battini Meena Reddy @ B Meena Reddy, W/o B. Devaraj, Aged about 40 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s. Shrinidhi Rice Mill (Mill Code. 177955), R/o H.No.5-11-51/52/303, Priyadarshini Nagar, Nirmal, Nirmal District, Telangana - 504106.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. The State of Telangana,, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, Telangana. High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, Telangana.
3. The District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.15 of 2026 dated 04.02.2026 on the file of the Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District and Quash the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner in connection with FIR No.15 of 2026 dated 04.02.2026 on the file of Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Ch.Sudhakar, S/o. Satyanarayana, The District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

And

1. Battini Meena Reddy @ B Meena Reddy, W/o B. Devaraj, Aged about 40 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s. Shrinidhi Rice Mill (Mill Code. 177955), R/o H.No.5-11-51/52/303, Priyadarshini Nagar, Nirmal, Nirmal District, Telangana - 504106.

..Respondent/Petitioner.



2026:TSHC:15766

2. The State of Telangana,, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, Telangana. High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, Telangana.
..Respondent/Respondent Nos.1 & 2.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim order dated 02.03.2026 passed in CRLP.No.1620 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHARGAVAKRISHNA.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 2608 OF 2026

Between:

Mohd. Waheed, s/o. Mohd. Ishaq, (Owner of M/s. Fauziya Traders Hangara, Potangal(M)) Aged about 65 years, occ. Business, R/o. Pothangal Village and Mandal, Nizamabad District.

...PETITIONER/ ACCUSED.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Bodhan Rural, Nizamabad District.
2. M.Srikanth Reddy, s/o. not known, Aged not known to the Petitioners, Occ. Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Nizamabad-503001

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.28 of 2026 on the file of PS Kotagiri, Nizamabad dated 17-02-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(5), 318(4), r/w. 3(5) BNS, 7 ECA, and to pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.28 of 2026 on the file of PS Kotagiri, Nizamabad dated 17-02-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(5), 318(4), r/w. 3(5) BNS, 7 ECA, including arrest of the Petitioner, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Between:

M.Srikanth Reddy, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., (TGSCSCL), Nizamabad-503001.



And

1. Mohd. Waheed, s/o. Mohd. Ishaq, (Owner of M/s. Fauziya Traders Hangara, Potangal(M)) Aged about 65 years, occ. Business, R/o. Pothangal Village and Mandal, Nizamabad District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Bodhan Rural, Nizamabad District.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the order dated 02/03/2026 in CRLP.No.2608 of 2026 and dismissing the Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 2818 OF 2026

Between:

Konda Laxmaiah, S/o. Gopaiah, aged about 70 years, Occ. Managing Partner, Ram Laxman Paraboled Rice Mill Ltd., R/o. H.No.6-2-920, Ramagiri, Nalgonda Town and District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent.

2. B.Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ. District Manager (FAC), Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalgonda Town and District.

...Respondent/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings in FIR.No.75/2026 on the file P.S. Nalgonda-II Town, against the petitioner/ Accused herein in the interest of Justice and equity.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings in FIR.No.75/2026 on the file P.S. Nalgonda – II Town, against the petitioner/ Accused herein including appearance of the petitioners and pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.



I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

B.Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ. District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalgonda District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Konda Laxmaiah, S/o. Gopaiah, aged about 70 years, Occ. Managing Partner, Ram Laxman Paraboiled Rice Mill Ltd., R/o. H.No.6-2-920, Ramagiri, Nalgonda Town and District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, Rep, by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05.03.2026 passed in CRLP.No.2818 of 2026 and dismiss the Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri VENKATARAMANAIAH.K, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 2853 OF 2026

Between:

M/s Sri Lakshmi Venkateshwara Rice Mill, Raigudem, Nelakondapally, Rep by its proprietor M. Rama Rao, S/o Venkateswarlu Mekala, Aged about 55 Years, Occ.Business, R/o H.No. 3-51, Indira Gandli center, Nelakondapally, Raigudem, Citheruvu Madharam, Khammam District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, through P.S. Nelakondapally, Rep by is Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. G. Srilatha, Occ. District Manager, Civil supplies Corporation, IDOS Khammam, R/o Khammam District.

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings against the petitioner in FIR.No.47/2026 dt. 24.02.2026 on the file of P.S. Nelakondapalli, for the offence U/Sec. 316(2), 316(5), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS and section 7 of Essential commodities Act.



2026:TSHC:15766

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings against the petitioner in FIR.No.47/2026 dt.24.02.2026 on the file of P.S. Nelakondapalli, for the offence U/Sec. 316(2), 316(5), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS and section 7 of Essential commodities Act pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

G. Srilatha, Occ. District Manager, Telangana Civil Supplies Corporation, Khammam, Khammam District.

..Petitioner/Respondent NO.2.

And

1. M/s Sri Lakshmi Venkateshwara Rice Mill, Raigudem, Nelakondapally, Rep by its proprietor M. Rama Rao, S/o Venkateswarlu Mekala, Aged about 55 Years, Occ.Business, R/o H.No. 3-51, Indira Gandli center, Nelakondapally, Raigudem, Chheruvu Madharam, Khammam District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, through P.S. Nelakondapally, Rep by is Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the order dated 06/03/2026 on CRLP.No.2853 of 2026 and dismiss the Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Praveen Kumar Veerjala, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 2856 OF 2026

Between:

1. Sanka Rajendra Prasad, S/o.S.Rajeswararao, Aged about 52 years, Occ . Business, R/o.H.No.8-2-50, Market Road, Bhadrachalam Post, Bhadradri Kothagudem District, T.G.
2. Bikkumalla Hanumantharao, S/o.B.Suralah, Aged about 54 years, Occ . Business R/o.H.No.11-11-17, Flat No.201, NMR Vagdeyi Residency, Road No.1, Telephone Colony, R.K.Puram, Saroornagar, Ranga Reddy District, T.G.
3. Mashetty Kalpana, W/o.M.Radha Krishna, Aged about 54 years, Occ . Business, R/o.Flat No.401, H.No.6-2-831, Meerbagh Colony, Srinivasa Towers, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.
4. Edukulla Manjulatha, W/o.E.Damodar, Aged about 53 years, Occ . Business R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.



5. Edukulla Tharun, S/o.E.Damodar, Aged about 27 years, Occ . B....., R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.

...Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1, 2 & 4 to 6.

AND

1. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Chityal, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.
2. Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Respondents/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioners/ Accused No.1, 2 & 4 to 6 in Crime No.38 of 2026, dt.22.02.2026 on the file of Chityal Police Station, Nalgonda District.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the Petitioners/ Accused No.1, 2 & 4 to 6 in Crime No.38 of 2026, dt.22.02.2026 on the file of Chityal Police Station, Nalgonda District, pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Sanka Rajendra Prasad, S/o.S.Rajeswararao, Aged about 52 years, Occ . Business, R/o.H.No.8-2-50, Market Road, Bhadrachalam Post, Bhadradri Kothagudem District, T.G.
2. Bikkumalla Hanumantharao, S/o.B.Suralah, Aged about 54 years, Occ . Business R/o.H.No.11-11-17, Flat No.201, NMR Vagdeyi Residency, Road No.1, Telephone Colony, R.K.Puram, Saroornagar, Ranga Reddy District, T.G.
3. Mashetty Kalpana, W/o.M.Radha Krishna, Aged about 54 years, Occ . Business, R/o.Flat No.401, H.No.6-2-831, Meerbagh Colony, Srinivasa Towers, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.
4. Edukulla Manjulatha, W/o.E.Damodar, Aged about 53 years, Occ . Business R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.
5. Edukulla Tharun, S/o.E.Damodar, Aged about 27 years, Occ . Business, R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.

..Respondents/Petitioners No.1, 2 & 4 to 6.

6. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Chityal, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05/03/2026 in CRLP.No.2856 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C.Hari Preeth, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 2857 OF 2026

Between:

Padma Kandukuri, W/o.K.Mahender, Aged about 57 years, Occ.Business, R/o. H.No.6-5-163/1, Raveendra Nagar, Nalgonda-508 001, Telangana State.

...Petitioner/ Accused No.3.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Through S.H.O, P.S. Chityal, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.
2. Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Respondents/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioner/ Accused No.3 in Crime No.38 of 2026, dt.22.02.2026 on the file of Chityal Police Station, Nalgonda District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings against the Petitioner/ Accused No.3 in Crime No.38 of 2026, dt.22.02.2026 on the file of Chityal Police Station, Nalgonda District, pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Padma Kandukuri, W/o.K.Mahender, Aged about 57 years, Occ.Business, R/o. H.No.6-5-163/1, Raveendra Nagar, Nalgonda-508 001, Telangana State.
..Respondent/Petitioner.
2. The State of Telangana, Through S.H.O, P.S. Chityal, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05/03/2026 passed in CRLP.No.2857 of 2026 and dismiss the Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C.HARI PREETH, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 2917 OF 2026

Between:

Musku Ranjith Reddy @ M. Ranjith Reddy, S/o Musku Chinna Reddy, Aged about 33 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s. Hanvika Rice Mill, R/o.2-3, Sunkli, VTC. Sunkli, District Nirmal, Telangana - 504109.

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, Telangana.
3. Ch. Sudhakar, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No. 22 of 2026 dated 17/02/2026 on the file of the Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District and Quash the same.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.22 of 2026 dated 17.02.2026 on the file of Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Ch. Sudhakar, S/o. Satyanarayana, aged 47 years, Occ: Working as District Manager, Nirmal District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.3.

And

1. Musku Ranjith Reddy @ M. Ranjith Reddy, S/o Musku Chinna Reddy, Aged about 33 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s. Hanvika Rice Mill, R/o.2-3, Sunkli, VTC. Sunkli, District Nirmal, Telangana - 504109.

..Respondent/Petitioner No.1.



2026:TSHC:15766

2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Bhainsa Rural, Nirmal District, Telangana.
..Respondents/Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 02.03.2026 passed in CRLP.No.2917 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHARGAVAKRISHNA.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 2928 OF 2026

Between:

Konda Venkanna, S/o. Laxmaiah aged about 43 years, Occ. Managing Partner Kanaka Mahalaxmi Paraboiled Rice Mill Ltd., R/o.H.No.6-2-920, Ramagiri, Nalgonda Town and District.

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep, by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.
..Respondent.
2. B.Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ. District Manager (FAC), Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalgonda Town and District.

...Respondent/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings in FIR.No.76/2026 on the file P.S. Nalgonda, II-Town, against the petitioner/Accused herein.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings in FIR.No.76/2026 on the file P.S. Nalgonda-II Town, against the petitioner/Accused herein including appearance of the petitioner and pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

B.Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ. District Manager (FAC), Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalgonda Town and District.



And

1. Konda Venkanna, S/o. Laxmaiah aged about 43 years, Occ. Managing Partner Kanaka Mahalaxmi Paraboiled Rice Mill Ltd., R/o.H.No.6-2-920, Ramagiri, Nalgonda Town and District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, Rep, by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05/03/2026 in CRLP.NO.2928 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri VENKATARAMANAIH.K, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 2944 OF 2026

Between:

Gattu Sravan, S/o. Swarajyam aged about 47 years, Occ.Managing Partner, Gouthami Paraboiled Rice Mill Ltd., R/o. H.No.6-3-92/D, Ramagiri, Nalgonda Town and District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep, by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent.

2. B.Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ. District Manager (FAC), Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalgonda Town and District.

...Respondent/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings in FIR.No.37/2026 on the file P.S. Nalgonda Rural, against the petitioner/ Accused herein in the interest of Justice and equity.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings in FIR.No.37/2026 on the file P.S. Nalgonda Rural, against the petitioner/ Accused herein including appearance of the petitioners and pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.



2026:TSHC:15766

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

B.Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, aged about 47 years, Occ. District Manager (FAC), Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalgonda Town and District.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Gattu Sravan, S/o. Swarajyam aged about 47 years, Occ.Managing Partner, Gouthami Paraboiiled Rice Mill Ltd., R/o. H.No.6-3-92/D, Ramagiri, Nalgonda Town and District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, Rep, by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent No.2.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim order dated 02/03/2026 in CRLP.No. 2944 of 2026 and dismiss the Criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri VENKATARAMANAIH.K, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for the Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3028 OF 2026

Between:

Rathod Dinesh, S/o Rathod Ramesh, Aged about 25 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/S. JSR RICE MILL, R/o 2-70/1, Marlagonda, Pardi (b), Adilabad, Andhra Pradesh - 504103, Business Address. 30/3/2, Narsapur G Mandal, Nandan, Nirmal, Telangana - 504104..

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, Telangana.
3. Ch. Sudhakar, S/o Satyanarayana, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.30 of 2026 dated 27/02/2026 on the file of the Police Station, Narsapur, Nirmal District and QUASH the same.



2026:TSHC:15766

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 30 of 2026 dated 27/02/2026 on the file of Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Ch. Sudhakar, S/o Satyanarayana, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Rathod Dinesh, S/o Rathod Ramesh, Aged about 25 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/S. JSR RICE MILL, R/o 2-70/1, Marlagonda, Pardi (b), Adilabad, Andhra Pradesh - 504103, Business Address. 30/3/2, Narsapur G Mandal, Nandan, Nirmal, Telangana - 504104.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, Telangana.

..Respondents/Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05.03.2026 passed in CRLP.3028 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHARGAVAKRISHNA.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 3029 OF 2026

Between:

Chawan Rohidas @ Chohan Rohidas, S/o Chawan Khamna @ Khamna, Aged about 50 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/S. SSDR RICE MILL, R/o 2-43/1, Marlagonda, Adilabad, Telangana-504103, Business Address. SY NO 30/3, Nandan Village, Narsapur-G Mandal, Nirmal District, Telangana - 504104.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, Telangana.



3. Sri Ch. Sudhakar, S/o Satyanarayana, Aged 47 Years, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana. 2026:TSHC:15766
...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.29 of 2026 dated 27/02/2026 on the file of the Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District and QUASH the same.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.29 of 2026 dated 27/02/2026 on the file of Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Ch. Sudhakar, S/o Satyanarayana, Aged 47 Years, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nirmal District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.3.

And

1. Chawan Rohidas @ Chowan Rohidas, S/o Chawan Khamna @ Khamna, Aged about 50 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/S. SSDR RICE MILL, R/o 2-43/1, Marlagonda, Adilabad, Telangana-504103, Business Address. SY NO 30/3, Nandan Village, Narsapur-G Mandal, Nirmal District, Telangana - 504104.
..Respondent/Petitioner.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Narsapur, Nirmal District, Telangana.
..Respondent Nos.1 & 2.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05.03.2026 passed in CRLP.No.3029 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHARGAVAKRISHNA.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for the Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 3074 OF 2026

Between:

Medam Krishnamurthy, S/o. Medam Somaiah, Aged 74 yrs, Occupation Retired, R/o. 6-5-236/1, Beet market, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District, Telangana - 508001.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED.



2026 TSN C:15766

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by the Station House Officer, P.S. - Nalgonda Rural, Nalgonda District.

..Respondent No.1.

2. Sri B.Rampathi, District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District - 508001
...Respondent No.2./Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records and examine the same in pursuance to the F.I.R No.36/2026 dated 23.02.2026 registered at P.S. Nalgonda Rural, Nalgonda District, under Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 against the petitioners.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings of the Petitioners in FIR No.36/2026 on the file of P.S. Nalgonda Rural, Nalgonda District under Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

I.A.NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District - 508001

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Medam Krishnamurthy, S/o. Medam Somaiah, Aged 74 yrs, Occupation Retired, R/o. 6-5-236/1, Beet market, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District, Telangana - 508001.
..Respondent/Petitioner.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by the Station House Officer, P.S. - Nalgonda Rural, Nalgonda District.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05.03.2026 passed in CRLP.No.3074 of 2026 and dismiss the Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri NAGULARAPU KEERTHI SIMHA, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3142 OF 2026

Between:

Ramesh Rajanna Chiliveri @ Chiliveri Ramesh, S/o Rajanna, Aged about 45 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/S. PRANAVI RICE MILL. R/o.H.No.4-42, Near Masjid, Morthad, VVaddyat, Vaddiyat, Nizamabad. Telangana-503225, Business Address Survey



No. 223/D, 225/C2, 225/A, Battapur to Tadpakal Road, Tadpakal. Nizamabad, Telangana.
- 503308.

2026:TSHC:15766

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana,, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer. Police Station Yergatla, Nizamabad District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Yergatla, Nizamabad District, Telangana.
3. M. Srikanth Reddy, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nizamabad District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.10 of 2026 dated 26-02-2026 on the file of the Police Station Yergatla, Nizamabad District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR.No.10 of 2026 dated 26-02-2026 on the file of Police Station Yergatla, Nizamabad District, pending disposal of the criminal case.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

M. Srikanth Reddy, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Nizamabad District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.3.

And

1. Ramesh Rajanna Chiliveri @ Chiliveri Ramesh, S/o Rajanna, Aged about 45 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/S. PRANAVI RICE MILL. R/o.H.No.4-42, Near Masjid, Morthad, VVaddyat, Vaddiyat, Nizamabad. Telangana-503225, Business Address Survey No. 223/D, 225/C2, 225/A, Battapur to Tadpakal Road, Tadpakal. Nizamabad, Telangana - 503308.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana,, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer. Police Station Yergatla, Nizamabad District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Yergatla, Nizamabad District, Telangana.

..Respondent/Respondent No.2.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the order dated 05/03/2026 in CRLP.NO.3142 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal Petition.



This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHARGAVAKRISHNA.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 3143 OF 2026

Between:

Mashetty Radha Krishna, S/o.Mashetti Ramulu, Aged about 58 years, Occ. Business, R/o.Flat No.401, H.No.6-2-831 Meer Bagh Colony, Srinivasa Towers Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Petitioner/ Accused No.1.

AND

1. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Nalgonda Rural, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad
2. Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Respondents/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioner/ Accused No.1 in Crime No.36 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Nalgonda Rural Police Station, Nalgonda District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused No.1 in Crime No.36 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Nalgonda Rural Police Station, Nalgonda District, pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/ Respondent No.2.

And

1. Mashetty Radha Krishna, S/o.Mashetti Ramulu, Aged about 58 years, Occ. Business, R/o.Flat No.401, H.No.6-2-831 Meer Bagh Colony, Srinivasa Towers Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Respondent/ Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Nalgonda Rural, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad

..Respondent/ Respondent No.1.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim order dated 05/03/2026 in CRLP.No.3143 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal Petition. 2026.TSHC:15766

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C.Hari Preeth, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General Appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3144 OF 2026

Between:

Edukulla Damodar, S/o.E.Gurvaiah Aged about 53 years, Occ. Business R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1.

AND

1. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Munugode, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.

..Respondent.

2. Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Respondent/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioner/Accused No.1 in Crime No.28 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Munugode Police Station, Nalgonda District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the Petitioner/Accused No.1 in Crime No.28 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Munugode Police Station, Nalgonda District, pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/2nd Respondent.

And

1. Edukulla Damodar, S/o.E.Gurvaiah Aged about 53 years, Occ. Business R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town and District, Telangana State.



..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Munugode, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad. 2026:TSHC:15766

..Respondent/Respnodent.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05/03/2026 in CRLP.No. 3144 of 2026 and dismiss the Criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C.Hari Preeth, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3145 OF 2026

Between:

1. Edukulla Damodar, S/o.E.Gurvaiah Aged about 53 years, Occ. Business R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town & District, Telangana State.
2. Kandukuri Ravi Kumar, S/o.Kandukuri Lingaiah, Aged about 62 years, Occ . Business R/o.H.No.6-5-163/CS1, Ravindra Nagar Beet Market, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Petitioners/ Accused Nos.4 & 5.

AND

1. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Nalgonda Rural, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.
2. Sri B.Ramathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Respondent.

...Respondent/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioners/ Accused No.4 & 5 in Crime No.36 of 2026,dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Nalgonda Rural Police Station, Nalgonda District .

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the Petitioners/ Accused No.4 & 5 in Crime No.36 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Nalgonda Rural Police Station, Nalgonda District.



2026:TSHC:15766

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager,
TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/2nd Respondent.

And

1. Edukulla Damodar, S/o.E.Gurvaiah Aged about 53 years, Occ. Business R/o.H.No.6-5-178, Beat Market, Near TTD Kalyanamandapam, Nalgonda Town & District, Telangana State.
2. Kandukuri Ravi Kumar, S/o.Kandukuri Lingaiah, Aged about 62 years, Occ . Business R/o.H.No.6-5-163/CS1, Ravindra Nagar Beet Market, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Respondents/Petitioners.

3. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Nalgonda Rural, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 05/03/2026 in CRLP.3145 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C.Hari Preeth, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3206 OF 2026

Between:

V. Ravi Kumar, s/o.Ramakrishna, (Proprietor of M/s. Sri Raghavendra Industries, Old Varni (V and M), Aged about 39 years, occ. Business, R/o. 4-84, Nehrunagar, Varni Mandal, Nizamabad District.

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Varni. Nizamabad District.
2. M.Srikanth Reddy, s/o. not known, Aged not known to the Petitioners, Occ. Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Nizamabad-503001

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No. 39 of 2026 on the file of PS Varni, Nizamabad dated 25-02-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(5), 318(4) BNS, 7 ECA. .



LA. NO: 2 OF 2026

2026:TSHC:15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.39 of 2026 on the file of PS Varni, Nizamabad dated 25-02-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(5), 318(4) BNS, 7 ECA, including arrest of the Petitioner, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

LA. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

M.Srikanth Reddy, Occ: District Manager, TSCSCL, Nizamabad District, Telangana-503001.

..Petitioner/2nd Respondent.

And

1. V. Ravi Kumar, s/o.Ramakrishna, (Proprietor of M/s. Sri Raghavendra Industries, Old Varni (V and M), Aged about 39 years, occ. Business, R/o. 4-84, Nehrunagar, Varni Mandal, Nizamabad District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Varni. Nizamabad District.

..Respondent/Respondent No.1.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the order dated 06/03/2026 on CRLP.No.3206 pf 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3426 OF 2026

Between:

Smt. S. Ajitha, W/o S. Lingam, Aged about 59 years , Occ- Proprietorship/Business, Proprietor/Lease Holder of M/S. Sri Raja Rajeshwara Traders, R/o.Flat No. 505, Surya Towers, Rajyalaxmi Residency, Pragathi Nagar, Nizamabad, Telangana-503003, Business Address- Khanapur, Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad, Telangana.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad District, Telangana.
3. M. Srikanth Reddy, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., (TGSCSCL), Nizamabad District, Telangana.

...Respondents.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No. 69 of 2026 dated 25-02-2026 on the file of the Police Station Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad District and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.69 of 2026 dated 25-02-2026 on the file of Police Station Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad District pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

M. Srikanth Reddy, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., (TGSCSCL), Nizamabad District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.3.

And.

1. Smt. S. Ajitha, W/o S. Lingam, Aged about 59 years , Occ- Proprietorship/Business, Proprietor/Lease Holder of M/S. Sri Raja Rajeshwara Traders, R/o.Flat No. 505, Surya Towers, Rajyalaxmi Residency, Pragathi Nagar, Nizamabad, Telangana-503003, Business Address- Khanapur, Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad, Telangana.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamabad Rural, Nizamabad District, Telangana.

..Respondents/Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the order dated 10/03/2026 on CRLP.No.3426 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3433 OF 2026

Between:

Jaggappa @ Banja Jaggappa, S/o Banja Maruthi, aged. 57 years Occ. Business, R/o Khanapur village, Kalher Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, rep. by its Public Prosecutor High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.



2. G. Ambadas Rajeshwar, District Manager, TGSCSCL Sangareddy.

...Respondents/Defacto Complainant: 15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings in Crime No.5 of 2026 dated 20.01.2026 registered by Police, Sirgapur for the offences U/s 316 (2), 316 (5) BNS, 7 ECA in the interest of justice.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings in F.I.R.No.5 of 2026 dated 20.01.2026 registered by Police, Sirgapur for the offences U/s 316 (2), 316 (5) BNS, 7 ECA.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Between:

G. Ambadas Rajeshwar, District Manager, TGSCSCL Sangareddy.

..Petitioner/2nd Respondent.

And

1. Jaggappa @ Banja Jaggapa, S/o Banja Maruthi, aged. 57 years Occ. Business, R/o Khanapur village, Kalher Mandal, Sangareddy District.

..Resopndent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, rep. by its Public Prosecutor High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent.

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders passed in crlp 3433 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri N.Manohar, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No. and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3587 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Burugu Bala Kishan, S/o. B. Veera Mallaiah, Aged about 64 years, Occ.Business, R/o. H.No.6-5-126/a, Ravindra Nagar, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Petitioner/ Accused No.6.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, through P.S., Hayathnagar Rep. by its P.P., High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad.
2. Sri B. Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, Aged 47 years, Occ.District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda R/o. Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

...Respondents/Complainant.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records relating to Crime No.36 of 2026 dated 23.02.2026 by Police Station, Nalgonda, Rural on the file of Judicial First Class Magistrate (Special Mobile) Court at Nalgonda and quash the same. APPET HC:15766

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in Crime No.36 of 2026, dated 23.02.2026 by Police Station, Nalgonda, Rural on the file of Judicial First Class Magistrate (Special Mobile) Court at Nalgonda, including the arrest of the Petitioner pending disposal of the main petition.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B. Rampathi, S/o. Bheekya, Aged 47 years, Occ.District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda
R/o. Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/2nd Respondent.

And

1. Sri Burugu Bala Kishan, S/o. B. Veera Mallaiah, Aged about 64 years, Occ.Business,
R/o. H.No.6-5-126/a, Ravindra Nagar, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, through P.S., Hayathnagar Rep. by its P.P., High Court of
Judicature at Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 12/03/2026 in CRLP.No.3587 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Kavadi Naresh, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 3921 OF 2026

Between:

Mashetty Radha Krishna, S/o.Mashetti Ramulu, Aged about 58 years, Occ. Business,
R/o.Flat No.401, H.No.6-2-831, Meer Bagh Colony, Srinivasa Towers Nalgonda, Nalgonda
District.

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND



2026:TSHC:15766

1. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Munugode, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.
..Respondent.
2. Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.
...Respondent/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioner/Accused in Crime No.28 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Munugode Police Station, Nalgonda District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused in Crime No.28 of 2026, dt.23.02.2026 on the file of Munugode Police Station, Nalgonda District, pending disposal of the Criminal Petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri B.Rampathi, S/o.Bheekya, Aged about 47 years, Occ.Working as District Manager, TGSCSCL, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Petitioner/Respondent.

And

1. Mashetty Radha Krishna, S/o.Mashetti Ramulu, Aged about 58 years, Occ. Business, R/o.Flat No.401, H.No.6-2-831, Meer Bagh Colony, Srinivasa Towers Nalgonda, Nalgonda District.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana., Through S.H.O, P.S. Munugode, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High court at Hyderabad, Hyderabad.

..Respondent/Respondent.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 17/03/2026 in CRLP.No.3921 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C.Hari Preeth, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 4024 OF 2026

Between:

Mahammad Tajuddin, S/o Mahammad Haji Abdul Nabi, Aged about 55 years, Occ. Proprietor/Lease Holder of M/S. G.N. Traders, R/o 9-62/3, Thimmanagar Road, Pitlam,



Kamareddy, Telangana, 503310, Business Address B/No.1-115, Shivarbhramanapally (V),
Annaram X roads, Pitlam Mandal, Kamareddy District.

2026:TSHC:15766

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.51 of 2026 dated 15-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District and quash the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings including the arrest of the Petitioner in FIR No.51 of 2026 dated 15-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District pending disposal of the above Criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/ Respondent.

Anc

1. Mahammod Tajuddin, S/o Mahammod Haji Abdul Nabi, Aged about 55 years, Occ. Proprietor/Lease Holder of M/S. G.N. Traders, R/o 9-62/3, Thimmanagar Road, Pitlam, Kamareddy, Telangana, 503310, Business Address B/No.1-115, Shivarbhramanapally (V), Annaram X roads, Pitlam Mandal, Kamareddy District.
..Respondent/Petitioner.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
..Respondents/ Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacated the interim orders dated 18/03/2026 in CRLP.No.4024 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.



This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 4027 OF 2026

Between:

Rahul Chinuri, S/o Chinuri Ashok, Aged about 33 years. Occ Proprietor/Lease Holder of M/s Venkateshwara Traders, R/o.3/96, Masan Palle, Masanpally, Medak, Kather, Andhra Pradesh, 502371, Business Address 4-125/1, Main Road, Thimmanagar Village, Pitlam Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana-503310.

...PETITIONER/ ACCUSED.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.50 of 2026 dated 15-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District and quash the same.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.50 of 2026 dated 15-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/ Resondent.

And

1. Rahul Chinuri, S/o Chinuri Ashok, Aged about 33 years. Occ Proprietor/Lease Holder of M/s Venkateshwara Traders, R/o.3/96, Masan Palle, Masanpally, Medak, Kather, Andhra Pradesh, 502371, Business Address 4-125/1, Main Road, Thimmanagar Village, Pitlam Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana-503310.

..Respondent/ Petitioner.



2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
 3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Pitlam, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
- ..Respondents/Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim order dated 18/03/2026 in CRLP.No.4027of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 &2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 4058 OF 2026

Between:

1. Nikhil Yadav Totavar, s/o. Subhash, Aged about 30 years, occ Business, r/o. Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.
2. Laxmi Totavar, w/o. Subhash, Aged about 52 years, occ Business, r/o. Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.
3. Subhash Totavar, s/o. Hanumantha Rao, Aged about 55 years, occ Business, r/o. Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.

...Petitioners/ Accused Nos. 1 to 3.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.
2. Kokula Srikanth, s/o. Ramanjam, Aged 46 years, Occ Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Kamareddy.

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.31 of 2026 on the file of PS Nasrullabad, Kamareddy dated 15-03-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), r/w. 3(5) of BNS, Section 7 ECA.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.31 of 2026 on the file of PS Nasrullabad, Kamareddy dated 15-03-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), r/w. 3(5) of BNS, Section 7 ECA, including arrest of the Petitioners, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.



2026:TSHC:15766

J.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Kokula Srikanth, s/o. Ramanjam, Aged 46 years, Occ Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Kamareddy.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Nikhil Yadav Totavar, s/o. Subhash, Aged about 30 years, occ Business, r/o. Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.
2. Laxmi Totavar, w/o. Subahash, Aged about 52 years, occ Business, r/o. Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.
3. Subhash Totavar, s/o. Hanumantha Rao, Aged about 55 years, occ Business, r/o. Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.

..Respondents/Petitioners.

4. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Nasrullabad, Kamareddy District.

..Respondent/Respondent.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 18/03/2026 in CRLP.No.4058 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioners and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 4145 OF 2026

Between:

Smt. E. Godawari, W/o Swamy, Aged about 49 years, Occ. Proprietorship/Business, Proprietor of M/s. Sri Laxmi Durga Agro Industries (Mill Code. 177787), R/o H.No. 1-92/2, Bhoompally Village, Sadashivanagar Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Sadashivanagar, Kamareddy District.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Sadashivanagar, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.62 of 2026 dated 17-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Sadashivanagar, Kamareddy District, and quash the same.



Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 62 of 2026 dated 17-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Sadashivanagar, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Srikanth Kokkula,, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent No.2.

And

1. Smt. E. Godawari, W/o Swamy, Aged about 49 years, Occ. Proprietorship/ Business, Proprietor of M/s. Sri Laxmi Durga Agro Industries (Mill Code. 177787), R/o H.No. 1-92/2, Bhoompally Village, Sadashivanagar Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Respondent/Petitioner

2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Sadashivanagar, Kamareddy District.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Sadashivanagar, Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Respondents/Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim orders dated 24/03/2026 in CRLP.No.4145 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.

CRLP NO: 4249 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Bachu Krishna Murthy @ Krishnamurthy Bachchu, S/o.Sathya Narayana, Aged about 59 years, Occ. Proprietor/Partner, M/s. Sri Lalitha Devi Agro Industries, R/o 3-3-81, Gambhiraopet, Rajanna Sircilla District, Telangana - 505304. Business Address. Sy No 28, Chukkapur Village, Machareddy Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana - 503111.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.



District,
2026:TSHC:15766

2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Machareddy,, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Sri Kokkula Srikanth, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.55 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 55 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Kokkula Srikanth, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Petitioner/Respondent.

And

1. Sri Bachu Krishna Murthy @ Krishnamurthy Bachchu, S/o.Sathya Narayana, Aged about 59 years, Occ. Proprietor/Partner, M/s. Sri Lalitha Devi Agro Industries, R/o 3-3-81, Gambhiraopet, Rajanna Sircilla District, Telangana - 505304. Business Address. Sy No 28, Chukkapur Village, Machareddy Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana - 503111.

..Respondent/Petitioner.

2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Machareddy,, Kamareddy District, Telangana.

..Respondents/Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacated the interim order dated 24/03/2026 in CRLP.No.4249 of 2026 and dismiss the criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.3.



CRLP NO: 4250 OF 2026

Between:

Saheb Rao Are, s/o. Are Datha Patel, Aged about 68 years, occ Business. r/o. Birkur Village, Birkur Mandal, Kamareddy District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Birkur, Kamareddy District.
2. Kokula Srikanth, S/o. Ramanjam, Aged 46 years, Occ Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Kamareddy

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.42 of 2026 on the file of PS Birkur, Kamareddy dated 21-03-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of BNS. Section 7 ECA.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.42 of 2026 on the file of PS Birkur, Kamareddy dated 21-03-2026 for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of BNS, Section 7 ECA, including arrest of the Petitioner, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Advocate General appearing for Respondent No.2.

CRLP NO: 4255 OF 2026

Between:

Dawood Shaik, S/o Shaik Meera Sab, Aged about 73 years, Occ. Proprietor/Lessee, M/s Vittal Modern Rice Mill, R/o H.No. 3-13, Amdapur, Bodhan Mandal, Nizamabad District Business Address Door No. 7-110, Gopalpet Village, Nagireddypet Mandal, Kamareddy District - 503108, Telangana State.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District , Telangana.
3. Sri Kokkula Srikanth, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District , Telangana.

...Respondents.



2024-TSHC:15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No. 55 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 55 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent NO.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4256 OF 2026

Between:

Srinivasulu Baindla, S/o Kistaiah, Age. 40 Years, Occ.Proprietor, M/s.Uma Maheshwara Industries, R/o Inti nen 2-74/2, Malthummeda, Nagireddypet Mandal, Kamareddy District - 503108, Telangana State. Business Address. M/s Uma Maheshwara Industries, Door No 6-100/2, Maltummeda Village, Nagireddypet Mandal, Kamareddy, Telangana - 503108.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, Telangana
3. Sri Kokkula Srikanth, District Manager,, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No. 53 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 53 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.



2026:TSHC:15766

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the respondent NO.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4257 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Sailu Kummari, S/o Lingaiah, Aged about 41 years, Occ. Proprietor/Lessee, M/s. Thirumala Rice Mill, R/o H.No 2-87, Mardi, Medak District, Andhra Pradesh - 502287 Business Address Door No.4-39/1, Shetpalli Sangareddy Village, Lingampet Mandal, Kamareddy District - 503108, Telangana State.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Lingampet, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Lingampet, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Sri Kokkull Srikanth, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No. 49 of 2026 dated 18/03/2026 on the file of the Police Station Lingampet, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 49 of 2026 dated 18/03/2026 on the file of Police Station Lingampet, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4259 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Kondhuri Yadhagiri @ Yadhagiri Kodhuri, S/o Konduri Karishnaiah @ K. Kistaiah, Aged about 50 years, Occ. Proprietor/Lessee, M/s. Sri Venkateshwara Traders, R/o H.No. 5-5-95/1, Yellareddy (V and M), Kamareddy District, Telangana State-503122. Business Address. Door No. 6-1-42, Yellareddy Village and Mandal, Kamareddy District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.



2026:TSHC:15766

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Sri Kokkula Srikanth, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.75/2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No. 75 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4260 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Srinivas Muppidi, S/o Durgaiah, Aged about 49 years, Occ Proprietor/Lessee, M/s. Sri Rajarajeshwari Traders, Rio Narva village, Nizamsagar mandal, Kamareddy District. Business Address Door No 7-55, Malthummeda Village, Nagireddypet Mandal, Kamareddy District - 503108, Telangana State.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Sri Kokkula Srikanth, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for



the records in FIR No.54 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused. 2026.TSHC:15766

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.54 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Nagireddypet, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4261 OF 2026

Between:

Shekar Maddineni, S/o. Narsimha Rao, Aged about 55 years, Occ. Business, r/o. Veerapur Village, Birkur Mandal, Kamareddy District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Birkur, Kamareddy District.
2. Kokula Srikanth, S/o. Ramanjam, Aged 46 years, Occ. Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Kamareddy.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.41 of 2026 on the file of PS Birkur, Kamareddy dated 21-03-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of BNS, Section 7 ECA.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.41 of 2026 on the file of PS Birkur, Kamareddy dated 21-03-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of BNS, Section 7 ECA, including arrest of the Petitioner, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 Not appearing in person or through his counsel.



2026:TSHC:15766

CRLP NO: 4316 OF 2026

Between:

Konda Siddi Ramulu, Son of Narayana, Age. 63 Years, Occ. proprietor of M/s Sri Siddirameshwara Binny Rice Mill, R/o 2-59, Kondapur (V and M) of Nizamabad District (Adhaar Card No. 256324601545).

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep.by its Public Prosecutor High Court at Hyderabad.

..1st Respondent/State.

2. Kokula Srikanth, S/o. Ramanjam, Aged 46 years, Occ. District Manager, (CS Corporation), Kamareddy Dist.,

...2nd Respondent/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.27 of 2026 dated 14/03/2026 registered with Rajampet Police Station Kamareddy District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in pursuant to the registration of FIR No.27 of 2026 dated 14/03/2026 registered with registered with Rajampet Police Station Kamareddy District including the investigation, arrest and any coercive action against the Petitioner.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Somavarapu Satyanarayana, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4361 OF 2026

Between:

Vudugula Laxman, S/o Vudugula Venkaiah, Aged about 59 years, Occ. Business/Managing Partner, M/s. Kethaki Agro Industries, R/o H.No 7-99/1/17, Pitlam Mandal, Nizamabad, Telangana - 503310. Business Address Sy.No. 231, Nanded-Hyderabad Road, Velganur Village, Nizamsagar Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana - 503302.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.

2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, Telangana.

3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.



2026:TSHC:15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.47 of 2026 dated 23/03/2026 on the file of the Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.47 of 2026 dated 23-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4383 OF 2026

Between:

Paidi Suresh Reddy, S/o Late Narsihma Reddy, aged about 65 years, Proprietor, Sri Sai Kiran Rice Mill, Adloor Yella Reddy Village, SS Nagar Mandal, Kama Reddy District.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. The State of Telangana through SHO Sadashiv Nagar, Kamareddy, Rep. by Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana.

..Respondent No.1.

2. Sri Srikanth Kokkula, S/o Ramanujam, Aged about 46 years, Occ.District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited (TGSCSCL) KamaReddy District.

...Respondent No.2./Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to QUASH the FIR.No.61 of 2026 Dated 17.03.2026 on the file of P S Sadashivnagar, Kamareddy District against the Petitioner.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings including the arrest of the petitioner, in FIR.No.61 of 2026 dated 17.03.2026 on the file of Police Station Sadashivnagar, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri V.Ramesh Kumar, Advocate



2026:TSHC:15766

For the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4482 OF 2026

Between:

1. Sri Maddikunta Narsa Goud, S/o Bala Goud, Aged about 55 years, Occ. Business/Partner of Sri Bhagya Laxmi Agro Industries.
2. Smt. Maddikunta Vanaja, W/o M. Narsa Goud, Aged about 47 years, Occ. Business/Partner of Sri Bhagya Laxmi Agro Industries.
3. Sri Maddikunta Manoj Goud, S/o M. Narsa Goud, Aged about 32 years, Occ. Business.

All are R/o H.No 7-172, Reddypet, Machareddy Mandal, Nizamabad/Kamareddy, Telangana, 503144. Business Address Sy.No.423/1E Al, Vill. Reddypet, Mdl. Ramareddy, Dist. Kamareddy - 503 144, Telangana.

...Petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.62 of 2026 dated 24-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1, 2, and 3 in FIR No.62 of 2026 dated 24-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4483 OF 2026

Between:

Smt. Maddikunta Vanaja, W/o M.Narsa Goud, Aged about 47 years, Occ. Proprietorship/Business, Proprietor of Sri Bhagya Laxmi Binny Rice Mill, R/o H.No 7-172, Reddypet, Machareddy Mandal, Nizamabad/Kamareddy, Telangana, 503144, Business



Address Sy.No.423/EEA2, Reddypet, Machareddy, Reddipet, Kamareddy, Telangana, 503144. 2026.TSHC:15766

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.61 of 2026 dated 24-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner, in FIR No.61 of 2026 dated 24-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Ramareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4485 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Musthyala Sridhar, S/o Mustyala Sudhakar, Aged about 44 years, Occ. Business/Managing Partner of M/s Shiva Ganesh Industries, R/o H.No 3-1-9, Satelli Base, Yellareddy Mandalam, Yellareddy, Nizamabad/Kamareddy, Telangana, 503122. Business Address. M/s Shiva Ganesh Industries, Door No. 3-92, Annasagar Village, Yellareddy Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana, 503302.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.



...Respondents.
2026:TSHC:15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.74 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.74 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4486 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Panthangi Ramakrishna @ Panthangi Rama krishan, S/o Panthangi Ramulu, Aged about 47 years, Occ. Proprietor of M/s Bhavani Industries, R/o 5-3-94/5, New Abadi, Yellareddy Mandal, Yellareddy, Nizamabad/Kamareddy, Telangana, 503122. Business Address. M/s Bhavani Industries, Door No. 1-132, Mallaipalli Village, Yellareddy Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.76 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.76 of



2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition. 2026:TSHC:15766

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 Not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4558 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Shaik Mohammed @ Mohammed Shaik, S/o Abdul Siddique, Aged about 53 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s Anas Binny Rice Mill (Mill Code. 176131), R/o 9-9-48/4, Moghal pura Colony, Quilla X Road, Nizamabad, Telangana - 503001. Business Address. M/s Anas Binny Rice Mill, Door No. 3-47, Main road, Mathamal Village, Yellareddy Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana, 503122.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondent.s

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.77 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.77 of 2026 dated 18-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Yellareddy, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4559 OF 2026

Between:

Sri N. Srinivas @ Nangunoori Srinivas, S/o Nangunoori Pentaiah, Aged about 41 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s Renuka Modern Binny Rice Mill (Mill Code.174560), R/o



1-5-287/3/a, Rajanagar Colony, Kamareddy, Nizamabad/Kamareddy, Telangana-503111.
Business Address M/s Renuka Modern Binny Rice Mill, Door No.1-1/1B, Palwancha,
Machareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana, 503111. 2026:TSHC:15766

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, through The Station House Officer, Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager,, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Call for the records in FIR No.63 of 2026 dated 25-03-2026 on the file of the Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.63 of 2026 dated 25-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Machareddy, Kamareddy District pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4624 OF 2026

Between:

Padma Swamulaiah, Son of Padma Sayanna, Age. 62 Years, Occ. proprietor of M/s Sri Kedhareshwara Rice Mill, Thimmajiwada (Daggi) (V) of Sadashiv Nagar (M) of Kamareddy Dist, R/o No.8-7-78, Pedda Bazar, Near Water Tank, Nizamabad town and District (AAdhar card No.567128191200)

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep.by its Public Prosecutor High Court at Hyderabad.
..1ST Respondent/State.
2. Sri Kokkula Srikanth, Son of Ramanujam, Age. 46 Years, Occ. District Manager (C.S.Corporation), Kama Reddy Dist.

...2nd Respondent/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash



the FIR No.63 of 2026, dated 17-03-2026, registered with Sadashiv Nagar Police Station, Kamareddy district, and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and necessary in the circumstances of the case.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in pursuant to the registration of FIR No. 63 of 2026, dated 17-03-2026, registered with Sadashiv Nagar Police Station, Kamareddy district, including the investigation, arrest and any coercive actions against the Petitioner.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Somavarapu Satyanarayana, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4660 OF 2026

Between:

Chikoti Anusha, W/o. Venkata Kishore, Age. 36 Years, Occ. Business, R/ o. H. No. 7-8-107, Gandhi Nagar, Rajanna Sircilla District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, through S.H.O., P.S. Thangallapalli, Rajanna Sircilla District represented by Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.

..Respondent.

2. Singireddy Narasimha, S/o. Anji Reddy, Age. 53 Years, Occ. District Manager (TSCSCL), Rajanna Sircilla District, Rajanna Sircilla Proper and District. Cell No. 7995050723.

...Respondent/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the F.I.R.No.76 of 2026 of P.S. Thangallapalli, Rajanna Sircilla District, against the petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the petitioner/ Accused in F.I.R. No.76 of 2026 of P.S. Thangallapalli, Rajanna Sircilla District.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Venumadhav, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.



2026:TSHC:15766

CRLP NO: 4662 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Yelagandala Raghuveer, S/o Yelagandala Narayana, Aged about 45 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s Veerabhadra Industries (Mill Code. 18654), R/o H.No. 4-90, Mohammad Nagar Village, Nizamsagar Mandal, Gunkul, Kamareddy District, Telangana - 503302.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.51 of 2026 dated 28-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, and quash the same against the Petitioners/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.51 of 2026 dated 28-03-2026 on the file of Police Station Nizamsagar, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Gujjula Madhusudan, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 4781 OF 2026

Between:

Akula Ramesh @ Raghuram Ramesh, S/o. Akula Mogilaiah, Age 42 Years, Occ Business, R/o. H. No. 9-165/4, Bhavani Nagar, Opp. Old Bus Stand, Huzurabad Proper and Mandal, Karimnagar District.

...Petitioner/ Accused No.6.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, through S.H.O., P.S. Sulthanabad, Ramagundam Commissionerate, Peddapalli District, represented by Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.
2. Muppidi Srikanth, S/o. Venkateshwar Reddy, Age 46 Years, Occ District Manager (TGSCSCL), Peddapalli District. R/o.H.No.2-10-4/144, Vijetha Green City, Theegalaguttapalli, Karimnagar. Cell No. 7995050722.

...Respondents/ Complainant



2026:TSHC:15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the F.I.R.No.52 of 2026 of P.S. Sulthanabad, Ramagundam Commissionerate, Peddapalli District against the Petitioner/ Accused No.6.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the petitioner/ Accused No. 6 in F.I.R.No.52 of 2026 of P.S. Sulthanabad, Ramagundam Commissionerate, Peddapalli District.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Venumadhav, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 5194 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Pogartha Shiva Shankar, S/o Veera Badra Rao, Aged about 44 years, Occ. Business, Proprietor of M/s.Jagadamba Rice Mill (Mill Code. 178069), R/o House No.2-63/A/8, Thippapuram, Vemulawada Mandal, Rajanna Sircilla District, Telangana - 505302.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, The Station House Officer, Police Station Jukkal, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Jukkal, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to to call for the records in FIR No.51 of 2026 dated 06-04-2026 on the file of the Police Station Jukkal, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.51 of 2026 dated 06-04-2026 on the file of Police Station Jukkal, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate



2026:TSHC:15766

For the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 5220 OF 2026

Between:

Hanmandlu Konda, S/o. Kistaiah, Age- 69 Years, Occ- Proprietor of -Veeranjaneya Swamy Binny Mill, R/o.H.No.2-57, Kondapur Village, Rjampet Mandal, Kamareddy District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, The Station House Officer, Police Station Rajam pet, rep. by its Public Prosecutor High Court, High Court Building Complex at Hyderabad.

..Respondent.

2. Srikanth Kokkula, S/o.Ramanujam, Age- 46 years, Occ- Govt. Official Non-Gazetted R/o.H.No. 1, Kamareddy Village, Kamareddy Mandal and District.

...Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings against the Petitioner/ Accused in Cr.No.28/2026 dated- 14.03.2026, of P.S Rajam pet, Kamareddy District.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings in Cr.No.28/2026 dated 14.03.2026, Offence under Section 316(2), 318(3), 318(4), 314 BNS and section 7 of ECA, P.S Rajam pet, Kamareddy District.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Banda Prasada Rao, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 5252 OF 2026

Between:

1. Vasari Ramesh, S/o Punnaiah, Aged 60 years, Occ. Business R/o.Pitlam village and Mandal, Kamareddy District

2. Lingala Chetan Reddy, S/o Hanmantha Reddy, Aged 38 years, Occ. Business R/o.Banswada Village and Mandal Kamareddy District.

3. Jonna Pratap Reddy, S/o Narayan Reddy Aged 62 years, Occ. Business R/o Pitlam village and Mandal, Kamareddy District .

...Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 to 3.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Bichkunda, Kamareddy District.

2. Kokula Srikanth, s/o. Ramanjam, Aged 46 years, Occ. Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Kamareddy.

...Respondents/Complainants.



2026:TSHC:15766

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.67 of 2026 on the file of PS Bichkunda, Kamareddy dated 05-04-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) 318(4), 314 of BNS, Section 7 ECA.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.67 of 2026 on the file of PS Bichkunda, Kamareddy dated 05-04-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) 318(4), 314 of BNS, Section 7 ECA, including arrest of the Petitioner, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 5505 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Karkala Naganath @ Karkala Nag Nad, S/o K. Peeraji @ Karkala Piraji, Aged about 33 years, Occ. Business, Lessee/Proprietor of M/s Annapoorna Binny Rice Mill (Mill Code. 176245), R/o H.No. 7-98/4, Pulkal Village, Bichkunda Mandal, Kamareddy District, Telangana - 503306.

...Petitioner/Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Bichkunda, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Bichkunda, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District, Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.69 of 2026 dated 08-04-2026 on the file of the Police Station Bichkunda, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/Accused, in FIR No.69 of 2026 dated 08-04-2026 on the file of Police Station Bichkunda, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.



2026-TSHC:15766

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 5986 OF 2026

Between:

Sri Mohammad Gouse @ Md. Gouse, S/o Peer Mohammed, Aged about 59 years. Occ. Business. Proprietor of M/s Peer Mohammed Binny Rice Mill (Mill Code. 173890), R/o H.No 12-57/1, Near Jama Masjid, Bichkunda Mandal, Nizamabad/Kamareddy District, Telangana - 503306.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Station House Officer, Police Station Madnoor, Kamareddy District, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Madnoor, Kamareddy District, Telangana.
3. Srikanth Kokkula, District Manager, Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd (TGSCSCL), Kamareddy District. Telangana.

...Respondents.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in FIR No.75 of 2026 dated 16-04-2026 on the file of the Police Station Madnoor, Kamareddy District, and QUASH the same against the Petitioner/ Accused, and pass such other order or orders may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to STAY all further proceedings, including the arrest of the Petitioner/ Accused, in FIR No.75 of 2026 dated 16-04-2026 on the file of the Police Station Madnoor, Kamareddy District, pending disposal of the above Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Bhargavakrishna.L, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 6057 OF 2026

Between:

T. Padmasri, W/o T. Baleshwar Reddy, Aged about 45 years, Occ. Proprietor of M/s. SLNS Industries, R/o Solipur Village, Ghanpur Mandal, Wanaparthy District.

...Petitioner/ Accused.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana.



2026:TSHC:15766

2. Station House Officer, Police Station, Ghanpur, Wanaparthy District.
3. N. Anjaneyulu, S/o Narsimha, Aged about 50 years, Occ. District Manager, District Civil Supplies Corporation Office, Wanaparthy District.

...Respondents/Complainants.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR.No.37 of 2026, dated 18-04-2026 on the file of Station House Officer, Police Station, Ghanpur, Wanaparthy District for the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 7 of Essential Commodities Act.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay off all further proceedings including arrest of the petitioner in FIR No.37 of 2026, dated 18-04-2026 on the file of Station House Officer, Police Station, Ghanpur, Wanaparthy District for the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 7 of Essential Commodities Act, pending disposal of the above case.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Chalakani Venkat Yadav, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and of the Respondent No.3 not appearing in person or through his counsel.

CRLP NO: 6251 OF 2026

Between:

1. Renikunta Padmaja, W/o. Sri R.Shiva Kumar, Age 50 years, Occ. Business, R/o. Kagaznagar, KBM Asifabad District.
2. Budda Madhuri, W/o. Sri B.Manish, Age. 41 years, Occ. Business, R/o. H.No. 4-17, Lovavelly Village, Sirpur Town and Mandal, KBM Asifabad District.
3. Renikunta Shiva Kumar, S/o. Sri Namdev, Age 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o. Kagaznagar, KBM Asifabad District.

...Petitioners/ Accused Nos. 1, 2 & 3.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by the it's Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad (Through SHO, P.S. Sirpur-T).
2. Saadala Rajitha, W/o. Pentaiah, Age. 38 years, Occ. District Manager TGSCSCL, Kumram Bheem Asifabad district.

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.56 of 2026 and all it's consequential proceedings, on the file of P.S. Sirpur-T, Kumrambheem, Asifabad District, as against the petitioners/ A.1, A2 and A.5.



2026:TSHC:15766

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings pursuant to issuance of FIR No.56 of 2026, dated 05.04.2026, on the file of P.S. Sirpur-T, Kumrambheem, Asifabad District, including invoking the provisions under Revenue Recovery Act as against the petitioners/A.1, A.2 and, A.5, pending disposal of this Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Devineni Radha Rani, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through her counsel.

CRLP NO: 6385 OF 2026

Between:

Alle Anvesh, s/o. Alle Sailu, (Proprietor M/s. Sri. Sai Laxmi Agro Industries, Saloora Village) Aged about 27 years, occ. Business, R/o. Saloora Village and Mandal, Nizamabad District.

...Petitioner/ Accused No.2.

AND

1. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad through SHO PS Bodhan Rural, Nizamabad District
2. M.Srikanth Reddy, s/o. not known, Aged not known to the Petitioners, Occ. Employee, District Manager, TSCSCL, Nizamabad-503001.

...Respondents/Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the FIR No.3 of 2026 on the file of PS Bodhan Rural, Nizamabad dated 05-01-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(5), 318(4), r/w. 3(5) BNS, 7 ECA.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in FIR No.3 of 2026 on the file of PS Bodhan Rural, Nizamabad dated 05-01-2026, for the offences registered U/s. 316(5), 318(4), r/w. 3(5) BNS, 7 ECA , including appearance of the Petitioner, pending disposal of the main Criminal Petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Durga Prasad, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through his counsel.



CRLP NO: 6863 OF 2026

2026:TSHC:15766

Between:

1. Abhynay Kamalakar, S/ o. Prakash Rao, Age. 39 Years, Occ. Partner, Dutta Sai Modern Rice Mill, Tonkini Village, Sirpur T Mandal, Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District.
2. Mamatha Kamalakar, W/o. Abhynay Kamalakar, Age 36 Years, Occ. Partner, Dutta Sai Modern Rice Mill, Tonkini Village, Sirpur T Mandal, Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District.

...Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 & 2.

AND

1. The State of Telangana, through S.H.O., P.S. Sirpur-T, Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District, represented by Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.
2. Ms. Rajitha Sadala, D/ o. Pentaiah, Age. 38 Years, Occ. District Manager (TSCSCL), Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District, Asifabad, Cell No. 9281423643.

..Respondent.

...Respondent/Defacto Complainant.

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the F.I.R.No.57 of 2026, of P.S. Sirpur-T, Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District, against the petitioners/ Accused Nos. 1 and 2.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay of all further proceedings including arrest of the petitioners/Accused Nos. 1 and 2 in F.I.R.No.57 of 2026, of P.S. Sirpur-T, Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K.Venumadhav, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of the Respondent No.2 not appearing in person or through her counsel.

The Court made the following: **COMMON ORDER**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J. SREENIVAS RAO**

**CRIMINAL PETITION Nos. 2809, 957, 981, 1620, 2608, 2818,
2853, 2856, 2857, 2917, 2928, 2944, 3028, 3029, 3074, 3142,
3143, 3144, 3145, 3206, 3426, 3433, 3587, 3921, 4024, 4027,
4058, 4145, 4249, 4250, 4255, 4256, 4257, 4259, 4260, 4261,
4316, 4361, 4383, 4482, 4483, 4485, 4486, 4558, 4559, 4624,
4660, 4662, 4781, 5194, 5220, 5252, 5505, 5986, 6057, 6251,
6385 and 6863 of 2026**

DATE: 05.05.2026

Between :**Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026**

Kasam Sathvik

....Petitioner

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.957 of 2026

Ch. Ravikanth

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.981 of 2026

Smt. Kottam Veena @ K. Veena

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.1620 of 2026

Battini Meena Reddy @ B. Meena Reddy

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2608 of 2026

Mohd. Waheed

....Petitioner/accused

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2818 of 2026

Konda Laxmaiah

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2853 of 2026

M/s. Sri Lakshmi Venkateshwara Rice Mill

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2856 of 2026

Sanka Rajendra Prasad and four others

....Petitioners/accused Nos.1, 2 and 4 to 6

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.2857 of 2026

Padma Kandukuri

....Petitioner/accused No.3

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2917 of 2026

Musku Ranjith Reddy @ M. Ranjith Reddy

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2928 of 2026

Konda Venkanna

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.2944 of 2026

Gattu Sravan

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3028 of 2026

Rathod Dinesh

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.3029 of 2026

Chavan Rohidas @ Chowan Rohidas

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3074 of 2026

Medam Krishnamurthy

....Petitioner/accused No.3

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3142 of 2026

Ramesh Rajanna Chiliveri @ Chiliveri Ramesh

....Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3143 of 2026

Mashetty Radha Krishna

....Petitioner/accused No.1

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3144 of 2026

Edukulla Damodar

....Petitioner/accused No.1

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.3145 of 2026

Edukulla Damodar and another

....Petitioners/accused Nos.4 and 5

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3206 of 2026

V. Ravi Kumar

....Petitioner/accused

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3426 of 2026

Smt. S. Ajitha

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3433 of 2026

Jaggappa @ Banja Jaggappa

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.3587 of 2026

Sri Burugu Bala Kishan

....Petitioner/accused No.6

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.3921 of 2026

Mashetty Radha Krishna

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4024 of 2026

Mahammod Tajuddin

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4027 of 2026

Rahul Chinuri

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4058 of 2026

Nikhil Yadav Totavar and two others

....Petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4145 of 2026

Smt. E. Godawari

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.4249 of 2026

Sri Bachu Krishna Murthy @ Krishnamurthy Bachchu

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4250 of 2026

Saheb Rao Are

....Petitioner/accused

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4255 of 2026

Dawood Shaik

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4256 of 2026

Srinivasulu Baindla

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4257 of 2026

Sri Sailu Kummari

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4259 of 2026



Sri Kondhuri Yadhagiri @ Yadhagiri Kodhuri

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4260 of 2026

Sri Srinivas Muppidi

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4261 of 2026

Shekar Maddineni

....Petitioner/accused

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4316 of 2026

Konda Siddi Ramulu

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4361 of 2026

Vudugula Laxman

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4383 of 2026

Paidi Suresh Reddy

....Petitioner/accused



AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4482 of 2026

Sri Maddikunta Narsa Goud and two others

....Petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4483 of 2026

Smt. Maddikunta Vanaja

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4485 of 2026

Sri Musthyala Sridhar

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4486 of 2026

Sri Panthangi Ramakrishna @ Panthangi Rama Krishan

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4558 of 2026

Sri Shaik Mohammed @ Mohammed Shaik

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents



Crl.P.No.4559 of 2026

Sri N. Srinivas @ Nangunoori Srinivas

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4624 of 2026

Padma Swamulaiah

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4660 of 2026

Chikoti Anusha

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4662 of 2026

Sri Yelagandala Raghuveer

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.4781 of 2026

Akula Ramesh @ Raghuram Ramesh

....Petitioner/accused No.6

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.5194 of 2026

Sri Pogartha Shiva Shankar



....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.5220 of 2026

Hanmandlu Konda

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.5252 of 2026

Vasari Ramesh and two others

....Petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.5505 of 2026

Sri Karkala Naganath @ Karkala Nag Nad

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.5986 of 2026

Sri Mohammad Gouse @ Md. Gouse

....Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.6057 of 2026

T.Padmasri

....Petitioner/accused

AND



The State of Telangana and two others

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.6251 of 2026

Renikunta Padmaja and two others

....Petitioners/accused Nos.1, 2 and 5

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.6385 of 2026

Alle Anvesh

....Petitioner/accused No.2

AND

State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

Crl.P.No.6863 of 2026

Abhynay Kamalakar and another

....Petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 2

AND

The State of Telangana and another

....Respondents

: COMMON ORDER:

Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026 has been filed by the petitioner/accused under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'the BNSS'), seeking to quash the proceedings in F.I.R.No.32 of 2026 of Kethapally Police Station, Nalgonda District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, the BNS) and Section 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (for short, 'E.C. Act').



2. The other criminal petitions have been filed by the petitioner/s seeking to quash the proceedings which are set out in a tabular form for the following offences:

Cr.P.No.	F.I.R.No.	Name of the Police Station	Name of the District	Registered for the offences
957 /2026	95 of 2024	Kataram	Jayashankar Bhupalapally	403, 420, 406 of IPC
981 /2026	25 of 2026	Kothakota	Wanaparthi	316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS and S.7 of E.C. Act
1620 /2026	15 of 2026	Bhainsa Rural	Nirmal	S.316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS
2608 /2026	28 of 2026	Kotagiri	Nizamabad	S. 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
2818 /2026	75 of 2026	Nalgonda II Town	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
2853 /2026	47 of 2027	Nelakondapalli	Khammam	S.316(2), 316(5), 318(4), 61(2) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
2856 /2026	38 of 2026	Chityal	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
2857 /2026	38 of 2026	Chityal	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
2917 /2026	22 of 2026	Bhainsa	Nirmal	S.316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS
2928 /2026	76 of 2026	Nalgonda II Town	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
2944 /2026	37 of 2026	Nalgonda Rural	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) r/w.3(5) of the BNS
3028 /2026	30 of 2026	Narsapur	Nirmal	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3029 /2026	29 of 2026	Narsapur	Nirmal	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3074 /2026	36 of 2026	Nalgonda Rural	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS
3142 /2026	10 of 2026	Yergatla	Nizamabad	S. 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3143 /2026	36 of 2026	Nalgonda Rural	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act



3144	/2026	28 of 2026	Mungode	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3145	/2026	36 of 2026	Nalgonda Rural	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS
3206	/2026	39 of 2026	Varni	Nizamabad	S. 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3426	/2026	69 of 2026	Nizamabad Rural	Nizamabad	S. 316(5) 318(4) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3433	/2026	5 of 2026	Sirgapur	Sangareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
3587	/2026	36 of 2026	Nalgonda Rural	Nalgonda	316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS
3921	/2026	28 of 2026	Mungode	Nalgonda	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4024	/2026	51 of 2026	Pitlam	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4027	/2026	50 of 2026	Pitlam	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4058	/2026	31 of 2026	Nasrullabad	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4145	/2026	62 of 2026	Sadashiv Nagar	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4249	/2026	55 of 2026	Machareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4250	/2026	42 of 2026	Birkur	Kamareddy	316(2), 315(3), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4255	/2026	55 of 2026	Nagireddypet	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4256	/2026	53 of 2026	Nagireddypet	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4257	/2026	49 of 2026	Lingampet	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4259	/2026	75 of 2026	Yellareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act



4260	/2026	54 of 2026	Nagireddypet	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4261	/2026	41 of 2026	Birkur	Kamareddy	S.316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4316	/2026	27 of 2026	Rajampet	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4361	/2026	47 of 2026	Nizamsagar	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C.Act
4383	/2026	61 of 2026	Sadashiv Nagar	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4482	/2026	62 of 2026	Ramareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4483	/2026	61 of 2026	Ramareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4485	/2026	74 of 2026	Yellareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4486	/2026	76 of 2026	Yellareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4558	/2026	77 of 2026	Yellareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4559	/2026	63 of 2026	Machareddy	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4624	/2026	63 of 2026	Sadashiv Nagar	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4660	/2026	76 of 2026	Thangallapalli	Rajanna Sircilla	S.318(4), 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4662	/2026	51 of 2026	Nizamsagar	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
4781	/2026	52 of 2026	Sulthanabad	Ramagundam	S.316(2), 316(5), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
5194	/2026	51 of 2026	Jukkal	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act



5220	/2026	28 of 2026	Rajampet	Kamareddy	316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
5252	/2026	67 of 2026	Bichkunda	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
5505	/2026	69 of 2026	Bichkunda	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
5986	/2026	75 of 2026	Madnoor	Kamareddy	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 314 of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
6057	/2026	37 of 2026	Ghanpur	Wanaparthi	S.316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act
6251	/2026	56 of 2026	Sirpur-T	Kumrambheem Asifabad	S. 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7-A of the E.C. Act
6385	/2026	3 of 2026	Bodhan Rural	Nizamabad	S. 316(5), 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the BNS & S.7 of the E.C. Act

3. The issue involved in these criminal petitions is one and the same. Hence, all these criminal petitions are clubbed together and being disposed of by way of a common order.

4. For the facility of reference, the facts from CrI.P.No.2809 of 2026 are being referred to.

5. **Brief facts of the case:**

5.1. On 23.02.2026, respondent No.2-The District Manager, TGSCSCL, Naglonda, lodged a complaint stating that the Government entrusted the paddy to M/s.Chamundeshwari Agro Industries, Uppalapahad, Kethepally, and entered into an agreement with Rice Miller for Custom Milling of Paddy KMS 2022-23 (Karif & Rabi) (for



short, 'Agreement') for the purpose of milling and delivery of Custom Milled Rice (CMR). The petitioner, namely Kasam Sathvik, being the proprietor/representative of the said mill, was acting as an agent of Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited (for short, 'the Corporation') and held the paddy in a fiduciary capacity, with ownership remaining vested in the Corporation. It is further stated that the paddy was procured from farmers under Minimum Support Price (MSP) and the same was transported various agencies including to the petitioner's rice mill and the same was duly acknowledged by the miller, who was obligated to deliver rice at prescribed out-turn ratios. After milling and partial lifting through e-auction, a balance quantity of paddy was required to be available in the mill. However, upon receipt of credible information regarding misappropriation, a joint inspection was conducted on 16.10.2025. As per records, 13,967.186 MTs of paddy ought to have been available, but physical verification revealed nil stock, resulting in total shortage of paddy is 13,967.186 MTs. The miller failed to account for the shortage despite notices and also failed to clear the dues. The petitioner could not satisfactorily explain the shortfall of the stock worth Rs.34,10,64,715/-. As per the Agreement, such shortage entails recovery at penal rates and the misappropriation of Government paddy worth Rs. 45,36,16,071/- has caused substantial loss to the public exchequer and adversely affected the Public Distribution



System (PDS). Hence, the present complaint is lodged for the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'the BNS') and Section 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (for short, 'the E.C. Act').

6. Insofar as other criminal petitions are concerned, the allegations levelled in the complaints in respect of allotment of total paddy, CMR delivered by the petitioners, shortfall of paddy and other particulars are set out in the following tabular form:

Crl.P.No.	Total Paddy allotted (MTs)	After milling paddy to be available in the rice mill (or) After milling rice to be delivered (MTs)	Paddy lifted by the bidder/ Delivered CMR (MTs)	Balance paddy to be available in the mill (MTs)	Shortfall (MTs)	Worth of misappropriated paddy, along with penalty and interest (In Rs.)
957 /2026	4400.120	2948.080	2003.833	1409.324	1409.324	4,26,88,216/-
981 /2026	8618.460	5774.368	2697.480	4592.370	3824.530	13,14,94,510/-
1620 /2026	7606.360	5096.255	2087.800	4490.230	4490.230	17,18,04,415/-
2608 /2026	17016.800	6620.430	--	6620.430	6620.430	2,69,52,235/-
2818 /2026	44350.560	32815.800	1021.537	31794.263	7811.040	25,36,81,256/-
2853 /2026	3282.640	2199.368	142.986	2056.382	2942.647	10,88,39,646/-
2856 /2026	11813.280	7382.831	1428.980	5953.851	5953.851	19,33,64,859/-
2857 /2026	11813.280	7382.831	1428.980	5953.851	5953.851	19,33,64,859/-
2917 /2026	9877.120	8481.735	2833.052	5648.683	5648.851	21,48,57,299/-
2928 /2026	12856.200	8176.059	150.000	8026.059	8026.059	26,06,64,486/-
2944 /2026	21724.480	16265.657	285.265	15890.392	15890.392	51,89,99,505/-
3028 /2026	4892.640	2873.742	809.799	3683.719	3683.719	14,60,86,187/-
3029 /2026	5773.320	2408.091	1350.122	3758.213	3758.213	15,05,79,103/-
3074 /2026	24722.120	16576.620	4377.508	12199.112	6766.211	21,97,48,061/-
3142 /2026	25953.200	17761.040	--	16011.040	16011.040	6,34,77,394/-
3143 /2026	24722.120	16782.781	4377.508	12199.112	6766.211	21,97,48,061/-
3144 /2026	9927.760	6750.021	1644.584	1782.505	450.000	1,46,14,772/-
3145 /2026	24722.120	16782.781	4377.508	12199.112	6766.211	16,52,24,106/-
3206 /2026	3762.760	2521.048	173.750	3458.367	3458.367	8,71,97,143/-
3426 /2026	1203.440	813.540	716.286	134.357	134.357	45,79,245.29/-
3433 /2026	9738.079	6575.369	117.00	5064.178	4083.498	13,19,51,861/-
3587 /2026	24722.120	16576.620	4377.508	12199.112	6766.211	21,97,48,061/-
3921 /2026	9927.760	6750.021	1644.584	1782.505	450.000	1,46,14,772/-
4024 /2026	32780.800	21963.130	19175.370	4160.830	4160.830	85,65,366.80/-
4027 /2026	48509.200	32501.160	22981.150	14208.960	14208.960	2,92,62,256.60/-



4058	/2026	41568.800	27851.060	17927.560	14810.870	9447.240	21,917,596.40/-
4145	/2026	41771.600	27986.900	21460.000	2863.250	2863.250	2,26,00,860/-
4249	/2026	19850.400	13299.770	6960.000	9462.340	9462.340	2,19,52,628.80/-
4250	/2026	29676.400	19883.190	11978.760	11798.000	11798.000	27,371,360/-
4255	/2026	26321.200	17635.200	12855.320	7134.140	7134.140	1,46,92,021.40/-
4256	/2026	25958.800	17405.790	14384.210	4509.820	4509.820	92,41,291.20/-
4257	/2026	22175.200	14837.280	12094.770	4093.260	4093.260	84,22,381.60/-
4259	/2026	38241.200	25621.600	21248.860	6534.750	3534.750	1,34,61,585/-
4260	/2026	30305.600	20304.75	17132.450	4736.250	4736.250	97,56,675/-
4261	/2026	40172.00	26915.240	13630.000	19829.320	17947.320	41,637,759.20/-
4316	/2026	23802.400	15947.610	8700.000	10817.320	10817.320	2,50,96,182.40/-
4361	/2026	133647.200	86879.950	64302.280	29463.310	23383.150	4,93,92,758.39/-
4383	/2026	14957.600	10021.590	5727.190	6409.560	6409.560	1,32,03,693.60/-
4482	/2026	70425.600	47185.150	22330.000	37097.230	37097.230	8,60,65,573.60/-
4483	/2026	47755.600	31896.250	14210.00	26546.630	26546.230	6,15,88,181.60/-
4485	/2026	13997.800	9378.520	7457.800	2867.680	2867.680	59,07,420.80/-
4486	/2026	28174.400	18877.380	16508.960	3535.500	3535.500	72,79,635.80/-
4558	/2026	26246.400	17584.470	13250.050	6470.200	6470.200	1,33,01,068/-
4559	/2026	17941.600	12020.870	4880.700	10656.970	10656.970	2,47,24,170.40/-
4624	/2026	11959.600	8012.930	3719.960	6407.420	6407.420	1,31,99,285.20/-
4660	/2026	2596.280	1739.508	--	1270.623	1270.623	4,12,89,285/-
4662	/2026	47663.200	31934.340	28412.420	5047.320	5256.600	1,08,07,668/-
4781	/2026	8096.680	5505.742	1088.456	6462.237	6165.357	19,89,89,202/-
5194	/2026	76528.400	51274.030	11733.300	59015.790	56491.960	13,10,79,707/-
5220	/2026	24109.200	16153.160	3158.100	18646.350	12369.950	2,86,98,284/-
5252	/2026	135468.200	90763.370	36167.610	80620.060	54997.160	12,35,93,831.20/-
5505	/2026	25766.800	17263.750	11629.070	8405.920	8405.920	1,73,12,034.20/-
5986	/2026	51179.690	34290.390	19612.150	21907.830	21907.830	4,51,28,614.80/-
6057	/2026	7303.560	4893.385	--	3429.082	3415.762	12,29,53,070/-
6251	/2026	2936.520	1967.468	744.219	1825.744	1825.744	6,91,95,117/-
6385	/2026	8784.171	5900.431	2024.570	4844.827	4844.827	18,23,33,730.40/-

7. Mr. R.N. Hemandranath Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Sannapaneni Lohit, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026;

Mr. Vinod Kumar Deshpande, learned Senior counsel representing Mr. K. Venkataramanaiah, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.2818, 2928 and 2944 of 2026;

Mr. K. Buchi Babu, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.957 of 2026;

Mr. L. Bhargavakrishna, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.981, 1620, 2917, 3028, 3029, 3142, 3426, 4024, 4027,



4145, 4482, 4483, 4485, 4486, 5194, 5505 and 5986 of 2026, representing Mr. Gujjula Madhusudan, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.4249, 4255, 4256, 4257, 4259, 4260, 4361, 4558, 4559 and 4662 of 2026;

Mr. K. Durga Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.2608, 3206, 4058, 4250, 4261, 5252 and 6385 of 2026;

Mr.C.Hari Preeth, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.2856, 2857, 3143, 3144, 3145 and 3921 of 2026;

Mr. N. Keerthi Simha, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.3074 of 2026;

Mr. K. Naresh, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.3587 of 2026;

Mr. Somavarapu Satyanaraya, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.4316 and 4624 of 2026;

Mr.K. Venumadhav, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.4660, 4781 and 6863 of 2026;

Mr. Banda Prasada Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.5220 of 2026;

Mr. Praveen Kumar Veerjala, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.2853 of 2026;



Mr. N. Manohar, learned counsel for the petitioner in
Crl.P.No.3433 of 2026;

Mr. V. Ramesh Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner in
Crl.P.No.4383 of 2026;

Mr. Chalakani Venkat Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner
in Crl.P.No.6057 of 2026;

Mrs. Devineni Radha Rani, learned counsel for the petitioner in
Crl.P.No.6251 of 2026,

learned Advocate General appearing on behalf of respondent
No.2; and

learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of respondent
No.1/State.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONERS :

**8. Mr. R. N. Hemendranath Reddy, learned Senior Counsel in
Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026:**

8.1. Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in the present case. There are no allegations, much less specific allegations, against the petitioner. The entire allegations are levelled against M/s.Chamundeswari Agro Industries Private Limited (for short, 'CAIPL'). However, respondent No.2 in his complaint it is stated that an amount of Rs.45,36,16,071/- to be recovered from



M/s.Sumanjali PBI PVT, Nalgonda. Therefore, the petitioner is no way concerned with the present crime. Respondent No.2 filed complaint mechanically without arraying CAIPL as an accused and the petitioner has been implicated solely on the ground that he is the Managing Director of CAIPL and the same is not permissible under law.

8.2. He further submitted that even if the allegations levelled in the complaint taken face value, the ingredients of the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the BNS are not attracted against the petitioner. The petitioner is neither an agent nor an employee; the work entrusted under the Agreement was purely in the nature of job work. The Corporation themselves voluntarily supplied the paddy to CAIPL for the purpose of custom milling on payment of milling charges and other charges and CMR to be delivered to the Government.

8.3. He also submitted that the offence under Section 318(5) of the BNS is not attracted, as the petitioner does not come within the ambit of agent as defined under Section 182 of the Contract Act, 1872. The nature of the work entrusted to the petitioner falls within the "job work" as defined under sub-section (68) of Section 2 of the Central Goods and Service Tax, 2017.



8.4. Respondent No.2/District Manager of the Corporation lodged a complaint, without having authority or competency. As per G.O.Ms.No.23 dated 18.10.2022 issued by the Government of Telangana, Consumer Affairs, Food and Civil Supplies (CS.I.CCS) Department, the Collector is only the competent authority to lodge complaint. Even according to the Agreement, the Commissioner of Civil Supplies or MD, TSCSCL or Collector/Additional Collector/District Manager in writing to act on behalf of the Corporation. In the absence of any such authorization, respondent No.2 lodged the present complaint and the same is not maintainable under law.

8.5. He further submitted that the Agreement contains various terms and conditions, including Clause 13(4), which provides that, in the event of any dispute arising in relation to the Agreement, the same shall be referred to an Arbitrator. He submitted that despite the existence of this arbitration clause, the Corporation has not invoked the said clause, on the other hand, filed the present complaint.

8.6. Clause 14 of the Agreement stipulates all disputes arising under the Agreement shall be filed in the competent civil Court. Respondent No.2 ought to have approached the competent civil Court and filed a suit for recovery of the alleged due amount for non-



delivery of the CMR equivalent to the paddy supplied, on the other hand filed the present complaint by giving criminal colour.

8.7. As per the Agreement, the Government had issued G.O.Ms.No.23 dated 18.10.2022, framed the Operational Guidelines for Procurement of Paddy and Delivery of Custom Milling Rice for the Kariff Marketing Season 2022-23, wherein it is mentioned that the Corporation/Government has to allot maximum limit of paddy 8000 MTs only to Rice Mills. However, the Corporation allotted huge substandard quantity of 23,405.280 MTs of paddy to CAIPL. During the Kariff season 2022-23, due to heavy rains, the paddy stored in the mills was damaged. The Rice Millers Association of Telangana State, submitted representations to the Ministry of Civil Supplies on 07.06.2023 and 19.06.2023 explaining the problems being faced by the millers due to untimely rains drenched paddy from PPCs for custom milling for Rabi 2022-2023. Based on the said representations and the report of the Commissioner, TSCSCL, dated 24.07.2023, the Government of Telangana, issued G.O.Ms.No.18 dated 10.08.2023 constituting a committee to suggest measures for enhancement of milling capacity in the State and modalities for auction of surplus paddy and to decide auction price. Thereafter, the Government issued another G.O.Ms.No.1 dated 25.01.2024 constituting a State Level Committee (SLC) for auction of surplus



stock of paddy lying in the mills pertaining to Rabi 2022-23 by calling for fresh global e-tenders.

8.8. He also submitted that on 01.03.2024, the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution Department of Food and Public Distribution issued proceedings directing the District Managers, Corporation/DCSOS not to deliver CMR against Rabi 2022-23 paddy quantities allotted to successful bidders finalized through tenders. The Corporation had issued e-Tender Reference on 25.01.2024 for sale of Rabi 2022-23 FAQ paddy procured under MSP operations by TSCSCL through e-tender platform. The Government of Telangana, wherein it is stated that the paddy stock has to be physically inspected by the interested bidders, the paddy stocks are offered 'as is where is' basis. Pursuant to the tender, M.s.Suvarchala Trading Company and M/s.Trimaxi Agro Enterprises were declared as successful bidders and the bidders lifted entire paddy.

8.9. He further submitted that Corporation issued a notice dated 31.10.2025 directing the CAIPL to pay an amount of Rs.43,99,73,483/- within a period of seven days alleging that there is a shortfall of 13,967.186 MTs of paddy stocks, worth Rs.34,10,64,715/-, in the said rice mill and due to non-supply of CMR as per the Agreement, the petitioner is liable to pay for defaulted paddy at 125% of the rates of CMR along with interest @ 12% per



annum and also the Corporation shall invoking the provisions of Revenue Recovery Act. Pursuant to the said notice, the petitioner submitted a comprehensive reply on 03.11.2025 denying the allegations made in the said notice and requested to withdraw the same. Respondent No.2, without passing any order on the said reply, lodged the present complaint only with an intention to recover the alleged amount mentioned in the notice dated 31.10.2025 by giving a criminal colour, which is not permissible in law. Due to the pressures of the respondents, the petitioner Mill paid an amount of Rs.12,18,00,400/- to the bidder and the said firms were remitted the amount to the Government in respect of the paddy supplied by the Corporation.

8.10. He further submitted that the Corporation has not conducted a proper enquiry and has not submitted any iota of evidence as to how it arrived at the alleged shortfall of paddy, and that the alleged inspection was conducted behind the back of the petitioner. In the absence of such material, claimed huge amounts by issuing notices and the petitioner is not liable to pay the alleged amount.

8.11. He also submitted that the offences under Sections 316(2) and 318(3) of the BNS cannot co-exist, especially when there is no dishonest intention on the part of the petitioner, especially the Corporation themselves supplied the paddy for the purpose of



conversion into CMR and there is no criminal breach of trust is made out. The petitioner or CAIPL has not made any request the Corporation to supply the paddy. The Corporation themselves entrusted the job work. Hence, the above said ingredients are not attracted.

8.12. The respondent Corporation had issued proceedings under Revenue Recovery Act. Aggrieved by the same, some of the Rice Millers have approached this Court and filed W.P.No.17985 of 2024 and batch and this Court allowed the said writ petitions on 28.08.2024 and quashed the proceedings on the ground that the respondent authorities therein have issued the proceedings without following the mandatory procedure prescribed under the provisions of Revenue Recovery Act. However, the respondent authorities therein are not precluded from initiating proceedings afresh, by strictly following the due procedure laid down under Revenue Recovery Act, as well as the principles laid down in the judgment mentioned in the said common order. Aggrieved by the same, the Government/ Corporation have filed Writ Appeals before the Hon'ble Division Bench and the Hon'ble Division Bench had not suspended the order passed by the learned Single Judge only directed the respondents/writ petitioners or their family members are not to alienate their properties, till further orders and the said writ appeals are pending.



8.13. The Corporation framed the scheme in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 and framed guidelines. Pursuant to the said scheme only the parties have entered into the Agreement and the said Agreement is having statutory force and binding upon the parties. However, the respondent Corporation has filed the present complaint in contravention of the terms and conditions of the Agreement, without invoking the arbitration clause or without approaching the competent civil Court. The complaint has been filed by giving criminal colour for recovery of the alleged due amount, without conducting any enquiry and without determining the amount due and payable.

8.14. He further submitted that the Corporation has not paid milling charges, storage charges and other charges, and in fact, a substantial amount is due by the Corporation to CAIPL. If the Corporation invoked the arbitration clause, the real facts will come to light.

8.15. He further submitted that earlier, similar cases were registered for the offences under Sections 316(2) and 318(3) of the BNS only. With an intention to avoid following the due procedure as contemplated under Section 41-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/35(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'the BNSS'), filed the present complaint by adding Section 316(5) of the BNS, though the ingredients of the said Section are not



attracted against the petitioner. He further submitted that in similar circumstances, this Court in CrI.P.No.895 of 2025 while disposing of the case on 25.01.2024, has held that the offence under Section 316(5) of the BNS is not attracted and the punishment for the other offences levelled against the petitioners therein is below seven years, therefore, the Investigating Officer is directed to follow the due procedure as contemplated under Section 41-A of Cr.P.C./Section 35(3) of BNSS.

8.16. He also submitted that respondent No.1, in his counter, has not stated that the competent authority had granted authorization to him to file complaint. On the other hand, the Circle Inspector of Police filed a counter-affidavit on behalf of respondent No.2, wherein it is stated that, as per clause 4(p) of the Agreement, the District Manager is authorized to act on behalf of the Corporation and the complaint lodged by respondent No.2 is maintainable. He also submitted that respondent No.2 lodged the complaint after a lapse of inordinate delay, especially not mentioned any reasons for the delay and the same is fatal to the prosecution.

8.17. He further submitted that respondent No.2, in the counter-affidavit, relied upon the order passed by this Court in CrI.P.No.3305 of 2024 dated 01.04.2024. In the above said order, this Court relied upon the judgments in **Lalit Chaturvedi and others v. State of**



Uttar Pradesh¹, and Sadhupati Nageswara Rao v. State of Andhra Pradesh². The said principle is not applicable to the present facts and circumstances of the case, on the ground that **Sadhupati Nageswara Rao's** case, the fair price shop dealer was convicted for the offence under Section 409 of IPC. The fair price shop dealer falls within the ambit of employee/agent, as he is entrusted with the distribution of commodities and he receives incentives from the Government. However, in the present case, the petitioner is not an agent or employee, and the respondent Corporation entrusted paddy for conversion into rice (CMR) and the nature of work is only job work.

8.18. In support of his contention, he relied upon the following judgments:

1. **Sujoy Ghosh v. The State of Jharkhand & Anr.³;**
2. **Shri Kersi H Vachha and another v. State of A.P., Represented by the Public Prosecutor, High Court of A.P., Hyderabad⁴;**
3. **State of Madras (now A.P.) represented by District v. Jayalakshmi Rice Mill Contractors C.⁵;**

¹ 2022 SCC OnLine SC 579

² 2012 8 SCC 547

³ 2026 Supreme (SC) 288

⁴ 2017 Supreme (AP) 698

⁵ 1958 Supreme (AP) 40



4. **Sushil Sethi and another v. State of Arunachal Pradesh and others⁶;**
5. **Sharad Kumar Sanghi v. Sangita Rane⁷;**
6. **N. Gopinath and Ors. v. The State of Andhra Pradesh and Ors.⁸;**
7. **Atluri Sitaramdoss and another v. The State, S.H.C. of Police, Gudivada Town Police⁹;**
8. **Laxmi Nr. Sah v. The State of Bihar¹⁰;**
9. **Bal Kishan Das v. P.C. Nayar¹¹;**
10. **Inder Chand Bagri v. Jagadish Prasad Bagri and another¹²;**
11. **A. M. Mohan v. The State Represented by SHO and Another¹³;**
12. **Satishchandra Ratanlal Shah v. State of Gujarat and another¹⁴;**
13. **Delhi Race Club (1940) Ltd. and Ors. v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors.¹⁵;**
14. **S. N. Vijayalakshmi & Ors. v. State of Karanataka & Anr.¹⁶;**

⁶ (2020) 3 SCC 240

⁷ (2015) 12 SCC 781

⁸ 2022 SCC OnLine AP 1007

⁹ (1975) 1 APLJ 119

¹⁰ 1983 Supreme (Pat) 182

¹¹ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1732

¹² 2025 Supreme (SC) 1968

¹³ 2024 Supreme (SC) 258

¹⁴ 2019 3 Supreme 204

¹⁵ 2024 INSC 626



15. **Mahmood Ali & Ors. v. State of U.P. & Ors.**¹⁷;
 16. **Rajib Ranjan & Ors. v. R. Vijaykumar**¹⁸;
 17. **Naresh Kumar v. State of Haryana**¹⁹;
 18. **Kishan Singh (D) through L.Rs. v. Gurpal Singh & Ors.**²⁰;
 19. **Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. and Anr. V. N.R. Vairamani and Anr.**²¹; and
 20. **Anukul Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh and anr.**²²
9. **Mr. Vinod Kumar Despande, learned Senior Counsel in Crl.P.No.2818 of 2026**
- 9.1. Learned Senior Counsel, submitted that respondent No.2 does not have *locus standi* to file the complaint. As per the Clause No.8.1.3 (though it was shown as 9.1.3) of the Agreement, the Commissioner, Civil Supplies Department, VC & MD of TSCSCL alone is competent to lodge the complaint, and not respondent No.2-District Manager.
- 9.2. He further submitted that even according to the allegations levelled in the complaint, the inspection was conducted in the petitioner's rice mill on 08.08.2025 and a report was submitted on

¹⁶ 2025 Supreme (SC) 1137

¹⁷ 2023 5 Supreme 504

¹⁸ 2014 8 Supreme 195

¹⁹ (2024) 3 SCC 573

²⁰ 2010 6 Supreme 516

²¹ 2004 (7) Supreme 126

²² 2025 Supreme (SC) 1732



22.09.2025. The present complaint was lodged on 23.02.2026, after a lapse of more than five months from the date of the alleged report, without assigning any reasons for the said delay. Hence, the complaint filed by respondent No.2 is liable to be quashed on the ground of delay.

9.3. He further submitted that as per the Agreement, the petitioner and employees of respondent Corporation are responsible and Clause 9 of the Agreement deals with joint custody. However, respondent No.2 in his counter alleged that the role of joint custody of the Corporation officials is only limited and the same is not permitted under law, especially Clause 9(1) of the Agreement specifically stated that the paddy received by the second party/rice miller from respective PPCs shall be under the joint custody of the Corporation as well as the miller. The Deputy Tahasildar, Civil Supplies, of the respective area, or any other official nominated by the Collector, Civil Supplies, shall act as the joint custodian. Respondent No.2 with an intention to save their own employees filed the present complaint against the petitioner.

9.4. He further submitted that the petitioner firm, namely Ram Laxman Paraboled Rice Mill Limited, has approached this Court and filed W.P.No.25200 of 2024, questioning the action of the respondents therein in not lifting the paddy allotted to the petitioner



firm for the Rabi 2022-23, in furtherance of the global e-tender dated 25.01.2024, on 'as is where is' basis, as being illegal. This Court, by order dated 11.09.2024, disposed of the said writ petition directing the respondents to lift the CMR paddy lying in the petitioner's rice mill pertaining to the crop year Rabi 2022-23 within a period of four weeks from the date of disposal of the said writ petition. In spite of the specific direction issued by this Court, the Corporation or the respondents therein have not taken any steps to lift the paddy, and the competent authority has also not taken any action against the concerned officers. He further submitted that to constitute an offence under Section 318(4) of the BNS, there must be dishonest intention from the inception. In the present case, there is no allegation against the petitioner of any such dishonest intention from the inception. Hence, the ingredients of the offence under Section 318(4) of the BNS are not attracted.

9.5. He further submitted that respondent No.2, in the complaint, alleged that the petitioner is liable to pay an amount of Rs.25,36,81,256/- equivalent to the value of the paddy supplied by the Corporation, without any proper determination. As per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, respondent No.2 ought to have invoked the arbitration clause by referring the matter to the Arbitrator and the Arbitral Tribunal is only competent to adjudicate and determine the dispute between the parties. Without referring the



matter to the Arbitrator, respondent No.2 filed the present complaint only with an intention to harass the petitioner and to recover the alleged amount and the same is contrary to the terms and conditions of the Agreement and also law.

9.6. He further submitted that the petitioner does not fall within the ambit of an agent or employee. Therefore, the ingredients of Section 316(5) of the BNS are not attracted. Respondent No.2, with an intention not to follow the procedure prescribed under Section 35(3) of the BNSS and the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar and another**²³, implicated the petitioner for the offence under Section 316(5) of the BNS, though the same is not applicable.

9.7. In support of his contention, learned Senior Counsel relied upon the following judgments:

1. **Suresh Singh v. State of Bihar**²⁴;
2. **Kishan Singh (Dead) Through LRs. V. Gural Singh and others**²⁵;
3. **Dilwar Singh v. State of Delhi**²⁶;
4. **Hridaya Ranjan Prasad Verma and others v. State of Bihar and another**²⁷;

²³ (2014) 8 SCC 273

²⁴ 1989 LawSuit(Pat) 222

²⁵ (2010) 8 SCC 775

²⁶ (2007) 12 SCC 641



5. **S.K. Bhargava v. Collector, Chandigarh and others²⁸;**
10. **Mr. K. Buchi Babu, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.957 of 2026:**

10.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by Mr. R.N. Hemandranath Reddy, learned Senior Counsel, and Mr. Vinod Kumar Deshpande, learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the offences levelled against the petitioner are with imprisonment of less than seven years. The Investigating Officer, without following the due procedure prescribed under the BNSS, is proceeding with the investigation. The respondent Corporation has not issued any notice and has not determined the alleged amount mentioned in the complaint. In the absence of any such determination, the initiation of criminal proceedings is not permitted under law.

10.2. He further submitted that the Government of India issued Memo No.2809/CS-I CCS Dated 24.11.2025 extending the time for a period of 90 days for the delivery of FRK and for recovery of pending dues from the defaulter rice millers pertaining to KMS 2014-15 and KMS 2023-24. Even before the expiry of the said period, initiating criminal proceedings against the petitioner is contrary to its own proceedings.

²⁷ (2000) 4 SCC 168

²⁸ (1998) 5 SCC 170



10.3. He further submitted that in 2022, due to heavy rains, the stocks lying in the petitioner's rice mill were totally damaged and the petitioner sustained a huge loss. The petitioner submitted a request to the concerned authorities seeking compensation for the said loss. Based on the representation submitted by the petitioner dated 16.07.2022, an inspection was conducted by Giridhavar and a report was submitted on 20.07.2022. Pursuant to the said report, the Tahasildar, *vide* proceedings, dated 20.07.2022, addressed a letter to the RDO, Jayashankar Bhupalapally District, stating that due to heavy rains from 09.07.2022 to 17.07.2022 and the resultant Godavari floods, food products and materials kept in the petitioner's rice mill were damaged and the loss was assessed at Rs.57 lakhs and the said report was forwarded to the RDO and the Government has not taken any steps to reimburse the said amount to the petitioner, on the other hand, respondent No.2 filed the present complaint alleging that the petitioner committed default and not delivered equivalent paddy supplied by the Corporation and he is liable to pay Rs.4,26,88,216/-.

10.4. He further submitted that the allegations levelled in the complaint are purely civil in nature. As per the terms and conditions mentioned in the Agreement, there is no clause imposing interest. Contrary to the terms and conditions, imposed 12% of interest and the same is not permissible under law.



11. Mr. Somavarapu Satyanarayana, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.4316 and 4624 of 2026:

11.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the District Manager does not have the competence to lodge the complaint. The Tahasildar does not have jurisdiction to conduct an investigation in the premises of the petitioner's rice mill. He further submitted that neither the Tahasildar nor respondent No.2 has followed the procedure contemplated under Section 105 of the E.C. Act, on the other hand, they conducted search.

11.2. He further submitted that the alleged offences pertain to the Kariff season 2022-23. The present complaint was filed on 17.03.2026 with an inordinate delay. The Corporation issued a show-cause notice on 15.12.2024. The petitioner got issued notice on 11.09.2024 through their counsel requesting the Corporation to furnish various documents mentioned therein for the purpose of issuing reply to the show-cause notice. However, neither respondent No.2 nor Corporation furnished the documents, on the other hand, filed the present complaint. The nature of the allegations levelled in the complaint is purely civil in nature and the same is liable to be quashed.



11.3. In support of his contention, he relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **M/s.Neeharika Infrastructure Private Limited v. State of Maharashtra and others**²⁹.

12. Mr. N. Keerthi Simha, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.3074 of 2026

12.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in the present crime. The petitioner retired from the post of Director of M/s.Sumanjali PBI Private Limited much prior to the alleged entrustment of work relating to paddy for the Rabi 2022-23 season. The petitioner is not a signatory to the alleged Agreement entered into between M/s.Sumanjali PBI Private Limited and the respondent Corporation. The petitioner submitted his resignation to the Director on 23.07.2021 and his resignation was accepted by the Registrar of Companies and in Form MGT-7. He also submitted that the above said Company in their income Tax annual returns, it is specifically mentioned that the petitioner's directorship was ceased on 23.07.2021. Hence, the petitioner is no way concerned for the alleged entrustment of paddy to M/s.Sumanjali PBI Private Limited or delivery of CMR equivalent to the paddy to the Government. By virtue

²⁹ AIR 2021 Supreme Court 1918



of cessation of directorship, the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner is clear abuse of the process of law.

12.2. He further submitted that even according to the counter-affidavit filed of respondent No.1, the alleged Agreement was executed in the year 2022, whereas the stamp was purchased much subsequent to the alleged Agreement i.e., on 28.03.2025. Therefore, the alleged Agreement is not a genuine one.

13. Mr. C. Hari Preeth, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.3145 of 2026

13.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that petitioners submitted their resignations as Directors of M/s.Sumanjali PBI Private Limited on 01.04.2018 and the same was accepted by the Board of Directors of the Company as well as Registrar of Companies.

13.2. He further submitted that the alleged Agreement was entered into by the District Manager with M/s.Sumanjali PBI Private Limited in the 2022, which is much subsequent to the said resignation of the petitioners as Directors. The petitioners were not parties to the said Agreement and they are no way concerned with the alleged allegations of entrustment of paddy to M/s.Sumanjali PBI Private



Limited and not delivered the CMR to Corporation/Government. Respondent No.2 has implicated the petitioners solely on the ground that earlier they were Directors of the M/s. Sumanjali PBI Private Limited.

13.3. He further submitted that even according to the documents filed along with the counter-affidavit filed by respondent No.1, particularly, the seizure/recovery panchanama, wherein it reveals that the petitioners have submitted their resignations, as Directors of the Company, to the Registry of Companies on 01.04.2018. Hence, the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioners is a clear abuse of the process of law.

14. Mr. K. Durga Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.4250 of 2026

14.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that respondent No.2 is not having competent authority to lodge the compliant. Even according to the allegations levelled in the complaint, the officers of the Corporation conducted inspection in the rice mill of the petitioner on 26.02.2026 behind his back and lodged the present complaint on 21.03.2026 after a lapse of more than 22 days without assigning any reasons for the said delay.



14.2. He further submitted that the copy of the Agreement filed by respondent No.2 along with counter is incomplete and respondent No.2 has not filled the particulars of the parties in the Agreement and there are no signatures of both the parties. The Corporation supplied less quantity of paddy and substandard paddy to the petitioner rice mill. However, as per the Agreement, the petitioner rice mill has to supply 67% of raw rice and 68% of boiled rice. He also submitted that Clause 12 of the Agreement deals with joint custody and as per the said clause, the Deputy Tahsildar (Civil Supplies) of the respective area or any other Officer nominated by the Collector (Civil Supplies), shall be the joint custodian. Hence, the employees of the Corporation are also liable. On the other hand, to safeguard their own officials, respondent No.2 lodged the complaint against the petitioner.

14.3. He further submitted that as per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the Government has to pay milling charges, storage charges, maintenance charges, gunny bag charges, and various other amounts and the respondents are due huge amounts to the petitioner.

14.4. He further submitted that in earlier Agreements, there is no penalty clause and interest clause. However, the said two clauses were included in the present Agreements and all the clauses of the Agreement are one sided and in favour of the Corporation only.



14.5. He further submitted that the Officers of the Corporation have not conducted proper inspection. The alleged inspection was conducted in a hurried manner behind back of the petitioner and it was completed within three days and submitted report. Based on the alleged report, respondent No.2 lodged the present complaint and the same is not permitted under law and the same is liable to be quashed.

15. Mr. K. Venumadhav, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.Nos.4660 and 4781 of 2026

15.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that Government of Telangana, Consumer Affairs, Food & Civil Supplies (CS.I.CCS) Department, had issued Memo No.2809/CS.I.CCS/2025, dated 24.11.2025, wherein it is decided to recover the pending CMR dues from the default rice millers of the previous years pertaining to KMS 2014-15 to KMS 2023-24, excluding Rabi 2022-23 season auction paddy, and later, the Government of Telangana, Consumer Affairs, Food & Civil Supplies (CS.I.CCS) Department, had issued another Memo No.677/CS.I.CCS/2026, dated 25.03.2026, extending the time for supply of CMR for a further period of 3 months. Even before the expiry of the said period, respondent No.2 lodged the present complaint with an intention to recover the amount and the same is not permissible under law.



15.2. He further submitted that the allotted stock of paddy pertaining to 2022-23 Rabi season stocks is very much available in the rice mill premises. The petitioner has submitted representations to the Corporation and other authorities requesting them to permit the petitioner to deliver the stocks of CMR by way of FRK sanna biyyam. When the authorities failed to consider the said representations, the petitioner had approached this Court and filed W.P.No.8105 of 2026 and this Court disposed the same on 17.03.2026 directing the respondent No.2 therein to consider the representation of the petitioner for grant of time to deliver the quantity of rice within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and pass appropriate orders and communicate the decision to the petitioner. Till such time, respondent authorities are directed not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner. When this Court issued a specific direction not to take any coercive steps, respondent No.2 filed the present complaint and the same is not permitted under law.

15.3. He further submitted that the Corporation, without taking proper care, supplied sub-standard paddy, which was kept in the premises of the rice mill. Respondent No.2-Corporation conducted a public auction through e-tender, however, the successful bidder had not lifted the stock and the said paddy is not suitable for the CMR. Respondent No.2-Corporation has not taken any action against the



said bidder. He further submitted that the petitioner has executed a Bank Guarantee and provided sureties and that in the event of failure to deliver the CMR equivalent to the paddy supplied by the Corporation, the Corporation is entitled to take necessary steps in accordance with the Agreement by invoking the Arbitration clause or by approaching a civil Court for recovery of the alleged amount due and payable, on the other hand, filed the present complaint and the same is not maintainable under law, especially there is no aspect of criminality, as the allegations made in the complaint are purely civil in nature.

15.4. He further submitted that as per Clause 9.1.2(2) of the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the Corporation is entitled to recover the equivalent quantity of rice from the defaulter. As per clause 9.1.2(3) of the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the Commissioner, Civil Supplies Department, shall initiate criminal action against the defaulting second party and all other concerned, apart from disqualifying and debarring the second party from participating in future CMR operations. The Corporation, without initiating recovery for the alleged amount in accordance with law, has filed the present complaint solely based on Clause No.9.1.2 (3) of the Agreement, especially when the said clause provides that the Commissioner, Civil Supplies Department/VC & MD, shall initiate the criminal action against the defaulting party and all other



concerned. Whereas respondent No.2/District Manager has filed the present complaint and not the Commissioner/Vice Chairman and Managing Director, respondent No.2 does not have authority/competency to file the complaint.

15.5. He submitted that in CrI.P.No.4781 of 2026, the petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offences and the police have implicated him as an accused solely based upon the confession statement given by accused Nos.1 and 2, when they were in police custody, stating that the petitioner acted as a mediator during the purchase of rice mill by accused Nos.1 and 2 on 16.11.2023. He further submitted that the petitioner is not a signatory to the alleged Agreement entered into between respondent No.2 and accused No.1. There is no nexus or link to connect the petitioner with alleged crime. Hence, continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner is a clear abuse of the process of law.

15.6. In support of his contention, he relied upon the following judgments/orders;

1. **Ch.Anjaneyulu v. The State of Telangana and another (Criminal petition No.10576 of 2017);**
2. **Delhi Race Club Limited and others** (*supra* 15); and



3. Mitesh Kumar J, Sha v. The State of Karnataka and others (Criminal Appeal No.1285 of 2021);

16. Mr. K. Naresh, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.3587 of 2026:

16.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner resigned as a Director of M/s.Sumanjali Parboiled Private Limited on 14.02.2017 and the same was accepted by the Registrar of Companies. The said Company filed its annual returns from 01.04.2018 to 31.03.2019, wherein it is specifically mentioned that the petitioner does not hold any equity shares.

16.2. He further submitted that in the place of the petitioner, another Director, namely Kandhukuri Padma, was appointed and his shares were transferred in her favour. In the annual returns of the Company for the period from 01.04.2022 to 31.03.2023 also the petitioner's name does not appear in the list of the Directors. Thus, the petitioner is neither a Director nor a share holder and has no role in the said Company, in terms of Section 168(2) of the Companies Act. Hence, the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner is a clear abuse of the process of law.



17. Mr. L. Bhargava Krishna, learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.P.No.981 of 2026:

17.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are purely civil in nature arising out of a contract. Hence, the ingredients of Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(4) of the BNS and Section 7 of the E.C. Act are not attracted. He further submitted that the petitioner does not come within the ambit of an 'agent' or 'employee' as defined under Section 2(5) of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (for short 'CGST Act') and therefore, the ingredients of Section 316(5) of the BNS are not attracted against the petitioner. The Corporation entrusted the paddy to the petitioner's rice mill for conversion into CMR rice. The nature of the work entrusted to the petitioner is only 'job work' as defined under Section 2(68) of the CGST Act, and the said definition is squarely applies to the present case. The petitioner does not fall within the ambit of either an agent or an employee.

17.2. He further submitted that the allegations levelled in the complaint arise purely out of a commercial contract. As per the provisions of Section 222 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, the entrustment of the paddy to the petitioner for conversion into CMR



rice is purely contractual in nature and specific terms and conditions are enumerated therein. Therefore, the initiation of the criminal proceedings is not permissible under law.

17.3. He also submitted that as per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the petitioner shall not pledge the stock of the Corporation with any Bank or financial institution to secure any loan or financial assistance. Even according to the terms and conditions of the contract, the paddy was entrusted to the petitioner solely for the purpose of milling and for no other purpose. Hence, the petitioner does not come within the ambit of an 'agent'.

17.4. He further submitted that in respect of the Agreement pertaining to 2025-26 Rabi season, custom milling paddy KMS, the second party has been specifically described as an 'agent'. The said word was not incorporated in the earlier contract or in the present case so as to attract the ingredients of Section 316(5) of the BNS.

17.5. He further submitted that respondent No.2 Corporation has now prepared an Agreement in respect of KMS 2025-26 between Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited and rice miller, wherein the first party described as the Corporation and the second party i.e., the rice miller, is described as an 'agent'.



17.6. He further submitted in similar circumstances, this Court disposed of the Criminal Petition No.12037 of 2024 on 03.10.2024, Criminal petition No.12650 of 2025 on 25.09.2025, wherein it was held that Section 316(5) of the BNS is not attracted and the Investigating Officer was directed to follow the due procedure as contemplated under Section 41-A of Cr.P.C./Section 35(3) of the BNSS. Hence, the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner is a clear abuse of the process of law.

17.7. He further submitted that the order dated 01.04.2024 in Criminal Petition No.3305 of 2024 is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case, especially as the learned Judge, relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **N.Raghavender v. State of Andhra Pradesh, CBI**³⁰, dismissed the Criminal petition without properly considering the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Lalit Chaturvedi and others v. State of Uttar Pradesh**³¹, as well as the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

17.8. In support of his contentions, he relied upon the following judgments/orders;

1. **Uco Bank v. Hem Chandra Sarkar**³²;
2. **Lakshminarayan Ram Gopal and Son Ltd. v. The Government of Hyderabad**³³;

³⁰ (2021) 18 SCC 70

³¹ 2022 SCC OnLine SC 579

³² 1990(3) SCC 389



3. **Ashok Kumar v. State of Punjab³⁴;**
4. **Baldeo Narain Singh and others v. State of Bihar³⁵;**
5. **Vandana Jain and others v. State of Uttar Pradesh and others³⁶;**
6. **P.Krishna Bhatta and others v. Mundila Ganapathi Bhatta and others³⁷;**

18. Mr. Banda Prasada Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.P.No.5220 of 2026

18.1. He submitted that he adopts the submissions made by both the learned Senior Counsel. In addition to the same, he submitted that the respondent Corporation issued a notice on 31.01.2025 and, within a short span, issued a show-cause notice dated 03.02.2025. The petitioner supplied 550 MTs of CMR to the respondent Corporation. In spite of the same, respondent No.2 filed the present complaint on 14.03.2025. He further submitted that the notice was served on the family members of the petitioner, as the petitioner was hospitalized. Though the petitioner is ready to supply shortfall of CMR by way of installments over a period of two to three years, respondent No.2, without considering the same, filed the present complaint.

³³ AIR 1954 SC 364

³⁴ 2023 PHHC 035298

³⁵ AIR 1959 PAT 442

³⁶ 2026 INSC 192

³⁷ AIR 1955 Mad 648

**19. Submissions of the learned Advocate General:**

19.1. Learned Advocate General submitted that the petitioners have entered into a contract with the Corporation through a custom milling Agreement for KMS 2022-23 Kariff and Rabi seasons. The terms and conditions mentioned in the said Agreement are binding on the parties. The entire Agreement has to be read as a whole, and the petitioners are not entitled to rely upon any single clause in isolation. He further submitted that as per clause 3(a) of the Agreement, the petitioners agreed to custom mill the paddy of the Corporation and deliver CMR to the Government/Corporation in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement and the instructions issued by the Government/F.C.I. from time to time. The Government of Telangana issued Memo No.704/CS.I-CCS/2016 dated 16.10.2017, wherein it is stated that the District Manager, CSC, shall take action to file a criminal case at the Station House Officers having jurisdiction, where the defaulting rice mill is situated, through the Assistant Manager (Tech.) CSC and the Civil Supplies Deputy Tahasildar concerned, as complainant Nos.1 and 2. According to the said Memo, the District Manager of the Corporation is entitled to lodge a complaint against the defaulting rice millers. Hence, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the District Manager of the Corporation does not have the authority or competency to lodge the complaint against them is



not true and correct. The above said memo issued by the Government is still in force and the same is binding upon the petitioners.

19.2. He further submitted that as per sub-clause (b) of clause 3 of the Agreement, the petitioners had agreed to deliver 100% CMR to the Corporation and have also agreed not to custom mill the paddy to any other person or agency or in any other manner diverts its milling capacity for any other purposes. The petitioners further agreed to deliver CMR of the same variety of the paddy supplied to them, in accordance with the Fair Average Quality (FAQ) specifications issued by the Government of India/Telangana.

19.3. He further submitted that there is no dispute about entrustment of paddy by the Government/Corporation to the petitioners/Rice Mills for CMR. As per the clause 5(7) of the Agreement, once the paddy has been accepted by the miller through the truck chit, the paddy so received by the miller shall be considered to be correct in terms of the quality and quantity, and no dispute shall be entertained after such acceptance with regard to the quality and quantity of the paddy received by the miller.

19.4. The petitioner rice millers agreed under clause 5(8) of the Agreement to store the paddy received by them in their registered mill premises or any other place approved by the District Collector (CS), in



case of receipts exceeded the storage capacity of the mill, and it shall remain in the custody of the miller and the miller will be responsible for any shortage or damage to paddy/rice stocks.

19.5. He further submitted that as per clause 12(4) of the Agreement, the petitioners shall be entitled to milling charges, at the rates prescribed by the Government of India in the provisional cost sheet for KMS 2022-23 for Telangana State, only after completion of entire milling operations on satisfactory delivery of rice to F.C.I/Corporation and reconciliation of gunny accounts, paddy accounts, CMR delivery accounts and also after affecting any recoveries to be made arising after reconciliation. The petitioners have not delivered CMR to the FCI/Corporation as per the terms and conditions of the Agreement. Hence, the contention of the petitioners that the Government/Corporation have not paid the milling and other charges to the petitioners is not tenable.

19.6. He further submitted that clause 13(4) of the Agreement enumerates that in the event of any dispute with regards to this Agreement, the same shall be referred to an arbitrator. The said clause does not bar initiation of criminal proceedings merely on the ground of the non-invocation of arbitration clause.

19.7. He further submitted that the Government of Telangana issued G.O.Ms.No.23 dated 18.10.2022 introducing the policy for



procurement of paddy under MSP operations and delivery of custom milled rice for KMS 2022-23. In the said G.O., it is specifically stated that in order to ensure Minimum Support Price (MSP) to the farmers for their paddy produce and availability of good quality of grains i.e., rice, to the weaker sections at the affordable price for over all food security of the State.

19.8. He further submitted that in Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026, the Government/Corporation allotted a total quantity of 23,405.280 MTs of paddy during Rabi 2022-23 to the petitioner's rice mill. The petitioner's rice mill delivered CMR only 3,852.974 MTs. The balance paddy to be available in the rice mill after milling was 19,552.306 MTs. Out of the said paddy, the successful bidder lifted 5581.434 MTs as per the global e-tender for paddy dated 25.01.2024. After lifting the paddy by the bidder, the balance paddy to be available in the petitioner's rice mill is 13,884.305 MTs. During the course of physical verification, the Corporation found a shortage of 13,967.186 MTs of paddy, worth Rs.34,10,64,715/-. Consequently, the Corporation issued a notice dated 31.10.2025 directing the petitioner's rice mill to clear the dues amounting to Rs.43,99,73,483.00, after calculating penalty and interest, within seven days of receipt of the notice.



19.9. He further submitted that the petitioners with a dishonest intention from the inception diverted/misappropriated the paddy into their personal gains and have not delivered equivalent CMR to the Government/Corporation. There are specific allegations levelled against the petitioners that the Corporation entrusted the paddy as per the Agreement for conversion into CMR. However, the petitioners have not delivered CMR to the Government/Corporation/FCI and the equivalent paddy is not available in the petitioners' rice mill. The petitioners have misappropriated/diverted a huge quantity of paddy, due to which, the Government has sustained huge loss. Hence, the allegations made in the complaint attract the ingredients of the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the BNS and Sections 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 and the said offences are cognizable offences and the investigation is very much required. Hence, the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings at threshold.

19.10. He further submitted that there are specific allegations levelled against the petitioner that the Government/Corporation entrusted the paddy as per the Agreement for conversion into CMR. However, the petitioner with dishonest intention from the inception has not delivered CMR to the Government and the paddy is not available in the premises of the petitioner's rice mill. The petitioner has misappropriated a huge quantity of paddy, due to which, the



Government has sustained heavy loss. Hence, the allegations made in the complaint attract the ingredients of the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the BNS and Sections 7 of the E.C. Act and the said offences are cognizable offences and the investigation is very much required. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings at threshold.

19.11. In support of his contention, he relied upon the following judgments:

1. **Trisuns Chemical Industry v. Rajesh Agarwal and others³⁸;**
2. **Rajesh Bajaj v. State NCT of Delhi and others³⁹;**
3. **Neeharika Infrastructure Private Limited v. State of Mahashtra and others⁴⁰;**
4. **Sadhupati Nageswara Rao v. State of Andhra Pradesh⁴¹;**
5. **State of Punjab v. Pritam Chand and others⁴²;**
6. **Anshul Jotwani v. State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer and Others⁴³;**

³⁸ (1999) 8 SCC 686

³⁹ (1999) 3 SCC 259

⁴⁰ (2021) 19 SCC 401

⁴¹ (2012) 8 SCC 547

⁴² 2013 SCC OnLine P & H 26723

⁴³ 2026 SCC OnLine Chh 1948



7. **Nomula Pandurangam v. The State of Telangana and another (Crl.P.No.3305 of 2024);**
8. **Kabal Singh v. State of Punjab⁴⁴;**
9. **M/s. Jai Mata Di Rice Mill and another v. The State of Bihar and others⁴⁵;**
10. **Md. Mustafa Ansari v. The State of Bihar and others (Crl.Appeal No.1137 of 2017);**
11. **Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna and others v. M/s. Green Rubber Industries and others⁴⁶;**
12. **Ratanlal v. Prahlad Jat and others⁴⁷; and**
13. **Pawan Kumar v. State of Haryana⁴⁸.**

20. Submissions of the learned Public Prosecutor :

20.1. Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that there is no dispute in respect to the entrustment of paddy to the petitioner for milling and the petitioner has not delivered the equivalent quantity of CMR to the Corporation or the Government, thereby misappropriating a huge quantity of the paddy. The petitioner has neither delivered CMR nor returned the equivalent quantity of the paddy, nor paid the amount due, in spite of the notices issued by the Corporation.

⁴⁴ 1996 SCC OnLine P&H 531

⁴⁵ 2015 SCC OnLine Pat 8486

⁴⁶ (1990) 1 SCC 731

⁴⁷ (2017) 9 SCC 340

⁴⁸ 2005 SCC OnLine P&H 1115



20.2. He submitted that in the State of Telangana, there are more than 3,600 rice mills and the Corporation has supplied paddy for CMR to several rice mills. Except the petitioners rice mills, all other rice millers have duly supplied CMR to the Corporation/FCI. The scheme introduced by the Government is a welfare scheme to the public in general. The petitioners misappropriated the paddy supplied by the Corporation for their own purposes and the sale proceeds were allegedly invested in various real estate fields, the film industries and other purposes, with an intention to avoid the due amounts and approached this Court and filed the present criminal petitions. The petitioners misappropriated huge quantity worth of Rs.3,900 crores of paddy supplied by the Government/Corporation.

20.3. He further submitted that the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the Corporation/Government ought to have invoked the arbitration clause or approached the competent civil Court, instead of initiating criminal proceedings by lodging the complaints, is not tenable under law on the ground that the petitioners have misappropriated the paddy supplied by the Corporation to them for conversion into CMR and the said allegations constitutes the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(3), 318(4) and 314 of the BNS and Section 7 of the E.C. Act.



20.4. He further submitted that in Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026, respondent No.2- *de facto* complainant lodged a complaint on 23.02.2026. Based on the same, Crime No.32 of 2026 was registered on 23.02.2026 for the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the BNS and Section 7 of the E.C. Act. Soon after the registration of the crime, the petitioner approached this Court within a span of two days, with an intention to evade the investigation. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled to seek quashing of the crime at the threshold, as the matter requires investigation.

20.5. In support of his contention he relied upon the following judgments:

1. **Muskan v. Ishaan Khan (Sataniya) and others⁴⁹;**
2. **Onkar Nath Mishra and others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and another⁵⁰;**
3. **State of Haryana and others v. Bhajan Lal and others⁵¹;**
4. **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another⁵²;**
5. **Subash Sharma v. State of Haryana and another⁵³;**
6. **B. Narsa Goud v. State of Telangana (Crl.P.No.2728 of 2024)**

⁴⁹ 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 1050

⁵⁰ (2008) 2 SCC 561

⁵¹ 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335

⁵² (2012) 10 SCC 303

⁵³ 2013: PHHC:059659



7. **T.Narsimhulu v. The State of Telangana (Crl.P.No.1234 of 2024)**
8. **N. Raghavender v. State of Andhra Pradesh, CBI⁵⁴;**
9. **K. Bharthi Devi and another v. State of Telangana and another⁵⁵;**
10. **Indian Oil Corpn. V. NEPC India Ltd. and others⁵⁶;**
11. **Sundari Nageshwer Rao v. The State of Telangana and another (Crl.P.No.1461 of 2022);**
12. **Pawan Kumar v. State of Haryana⁵⁷;**
13. **Nomula Pandurangam v. The State of Telangana and another(Crl.P.no.3305 of 2024); and**
14. **Sadhupathi Nageswara Rao v. State of Andhra Pradesh⁵⁸**

REPLY SUBMISSIONS :

- 21. Mr. Vinod Kumar Deshpande, learned Senior Counsel in Crl.P.No.2818 of 2026**

21.1. Learned Senior Counsel submitted that during the year 2022-23, due to a natural calamity, the paddy supplied by the Government was damaged and the Government itself conducted an e-tender, pursuant to which, the auction purchaser/successful bidder lifted the stocks. Hence, the question of misappropriation of the alleged paddy by the petitioner does not arise. The judgments relied upon by

⁵⁴ (2021) 18 SCC 70

⁵⁵ (2024) 10 SCC 384

⁵⁶ (2006) 6 SCC 736

⁵⁷ 2005 SCC OnLine P&H 1115

⁵⁸ (2012) 8 SCC 547



the learned Advocate General as well as learned Public Prosecutor are not applicable to the present facts and circumstances of the case.

21.2. He further submitted that there is a clause of 'joint custody' in the Agreement. However, the respondent Corporationn has not initiated the proceedings against their own employees and lodged the complaint only against the rice mills in order to save their own employees. In the said Agreement, there is no definition of 'joint custody'. There is no allegation of criminality and the allegations levelled in the complaint do not constitute any offence. The inspection/verification was conducted on 08.08.2025, whereas the complaint was lodged on 23.02.2026 without assigning any reason for the delay.

**22. Mr. R.N. Hemandranath Reddy, learned Senior Counsel in
Crl.P.No.2809 of 2026**

22.1. Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the terms and conditions of the Agreement clearly envisage that the Commissioner, Civil Supplies of MD, TSCSCL or Collector/Additional Collector/District Manager is competent authority to initiate appropriate proceedings against the millers. However, the District Manager/respondent No.2 has lodged the complaint without any authority or competency, especially in the absence of any authorization on behalf of the Corporation. The petitioner is only a Director, respondent No.2 has not lodged the complaint against the



company/rice mill. He further submitted that even as per G.O.Ms.No.23 dated 18.10.2022, the Vice Chairman and Managing Director, TSCLCL, or the Collector are competent authorities to initiate action or lodge the complaints. When a particular procedure is prescribed under the Agreement and particularly under Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, the Corporation ought to have followed the procedure contemplated under the Act and not resorted to any other means or procedures. The Memo dated 16.10.2017 relied upon by the learned Advocate General does not have any statutory force and the same is not applicable to the present case.

22.2. He further submitted that the respondent Corporation initiated the proceedings under the Revenue Recovery Act in respect of the very same allegations and froze the bank accounts and ordered the closure of rice mills, which was set aside by this Court in W.P.No.17985 of 2024 and batch, by order dated 28.08.2024, granting liberty to the respondents therein to initiate proceedings afresh by strictly following the procedure laid down under the Revenue Recovery Act. However, the respondent Government/Corporation has neither determined actual loss through due legal process of law nor quantified the alleged misappropriated paddy, and instead initiated criminal proceedings.



structurally establishes a principle-to-principle commercial job work arrangement. The relationship between the State and the petitioner is exclusively governed by a formal written contract and the determination of the petitioner's legal capacity is purely a question of law and not a question of fact. Even according to the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the nature of the work entrusted to the petitioner is only a job work and, therefore, the ingredients of the offence under Section 316(5) of the BNS are not attracted.

25.2. He further submitted that District Manager was a party to the earlier Agreements excluding the present case. In the earlier Agreements, there was no mention of agent. However, for the year 2025-26 Agreements, the second party has been described as an 'agent' only with an intention to attract the ingredients of the offence under Section 316(5) of the BNS/Section 409 of IPC. In view of the same, the ingredients of Section 316(5) of the BNS are not attracted against the petitioner in the present case. The punishment prescribed for the other offences levelled against the petitioner is below seven years. The Investigating Officer ought to have followed the due procedure under Section 35(3) of the BNSS and the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar**⁶⁵.

⁶⁵ (2014) 8 SCC 273



25.3. In support of his contention, he relied upon the following judgments:

1. **Rajiv Thapar & Ors. v. Madan lal Kapoor (Criminal Appeal No.174 of 2013);**
2. **Sundari Nageshwer Rao v. The State of Telangana and another (Crl.P.no.1461 of 2022)**

ANALYSIS

26. Having considered the rival submissions made by the respective parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, it reveals that the Telangana Government has announced its Paddy Procurement Policy in the year 2015 and as per the said Policy and the Government Orders issued by the State Government, Rice Millers have to purchase paddy from the farmers at a MSP predetermined by the State Government and has to deliver 75% of the rice milled as levy to the Food Corporation of India, and the State Civil Supplies Corporation at a predetermined price. The rice millers were entitled to sell and move the remaining 25% levy free rice within and outside the State and also export the rice as per the then prevailing orders of the State Government from time to time. It was called Levy System which was abolished by the Central Government in 2015 and was duly followed by the State Governments. The newly formed State of Telangana traded the levy system for the custom milling system in order to provide more support to the farmers. The



FCI was replaced by the Corporation-Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited. Under the said custom milling system, the State directly purchases paddy from the farmers through different procurement centers at Village or Mandal levels and distributes the paddy to the rice millers for custom milling. The rice millers mill the paddy and supply to the State and receive predetermined custom milling charges. During Rabi 2022-23 marketing season under the paddy procurement policy, the Telangana State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited acted as the nodal agency for the State Government, procured massive quantities of paddy from the farmers at MSP and subsequently entrusted the said paddy to the various rice mills, including the petitioners' rice mills, for the purpose of CMR. In the said process, the Corporation and the petitioner/rice mill entered into an Agreement. As per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the miller is required to convert the paddy into raw rice and boiled rice at the out-turn ratio as specified by the Corporation, confirming to the FAQ standards prescribed from time to time, including fortified rice. The miller is obligated to deliver raw rice at 67% and boiled rice at 68% to the Corporation/Government/FCI equivalent to paddy supplied by the Corporation. In the event of default in delivering the CMR, the Corporation is entitled to recover the cost of shortfall in equivalent CMR for the defaulted paddy @ 125% of the rates fixed by the Government of India, along with



interest @ 12% p.a. on the actual payment amount, as well as any other expenditure incurred by the Corporation. In addition to the same, the Corporation is entitled to initiate criminal action against the defaulting party, disqualify and debar the miller from participating in future CMR operations and also entitled to recover the losses or damages from the miller as well as from the sureties, jointly and severally, in accordance with law.

27. A perusal of the complaint in CrI.P.No.2809 of 2025 reveals that there are specific allegations that the Corporation supplied 23045.280 MTs of paddy for the Rabi 2022-2023 season under the Agreement to the petitioner rice mill. As per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the petitioner was required to deliver 15905.741 MTs of CMR. However, the petitioner's rice mill delivered CMR boiled rice @ ratio of 68% to the FCI i.e., 1950.241 MTs, CMR raw rice @ 67% to the Corporation i.e., 659.932 MTs and 86.567 MTs of CMR delivered to the Philippines. The total CMR raw and boiled rice delivered to FCI/CSC is 2610.172 MTs and the paddy utilized for delivery of raw and boiled rice is 3852.974 MTs. The balance quantity of paddy that ought to have been available in the petitioner's rice mill after milling is 19552.306 MTs and that the paddy lifted by the bidder is 5581.434 MTs pursuant to the e-tender process dated 25.01.2024 and the balance paddy to be available in the petitioner's rice mill is 13884.305 MTs. The Vigilance Wing of the Corporation



conducted an inspection of the petitioner's rice mill premises on 16.10.2025 and upon physical verification, it is revealed that shortage of paddy is 13967.186 MTs and calculated the amount for cost of shortage of paddy comes to Rs.34,10,64,715/- and penalty @ 25% on costs and interest 12% p.a., the total amount to be recovered from the petitioner was computed at Rs.45,36,16,071/-.

28. The complaint further reveals that the Corporation issued several notices to the petitioner rice mill to clear the outstanding dues and the last notice dated 31.10.2025 was issued directing the petitioner to clear the dues within one week. However, the petitioner failed to comply with the same. The petitioner rice mill with a dishonest intention diverted and misappropriated the huge quantity of the paddy entrusted by the Corporation under the Agreement for CMR.

29. The contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners is that the Corporation, without proper verification of the records, inspection or determination of the actual shortfall of paddy through due process of law, has unilaterally determined and claimed a huge amount and the allegations levelled in the complaints against the petitioners are purely civil in nature and that the Corporation ought to have approached the competent civil Court for recovery of the alleged amounts or ought to have invoked the arbitration clause,



which is available under the Agreement, on the other hand, respondent No.2 has lodged complaints by giving a criminal colour and the same is not permitted under law. According to the respondents, the Corporation entrusted the paddy to the petitioners for CMR. However, the petitioners, with dishonest intention, diverted the paddy for their personal gain and failed to deliver the equivalent CMR as per the terms and conditions of the Agreement and the existence of an arbitration clause or not approaching the civil Court does not bar or nullify criminal prosecution, and therefore, the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings merely on the ground of non-invocation of the arbitration clause.

30. It is relevant to extract the clause 13(4) of the Agreement, which read as under:

“That both the parties have agreed that in the event of any dispute with regard to this Agreement, the same shall be referred to an Arbitrator. The Arbitrator shall be appointed by Commissioner, Civil Supplies, Government of Telangana/VC & Managing Director, TSCSCL.”

31. A perusal of above said Clause, it reveals that in the event of any dispute with regard to the Agreement, either of the parties is entitled to invoke the said clause. Even according to the petitioners, certain amounts towards milling charges, gunny bag charges, storage charges, and other dues remain unpaid by the



Corporation/Government, and they have also raised contentions with regard to the quality and quantity of paddy supplied by the Corporation. Even according to the petitioners, they have not invoked the said clause.

32. In **Kabal Singh** (*supra* 44), **Pritam Chand** (*supra* 42), **Subash Sharma** (*supra* 53), **Sadhupati Nageswara Rao** (*supra* 58), **M/s Jai Mata Di Rice Mill** (*supra* 45), **NEPC India Ltd.** (*supra* 56), **Pawan Kumar** (*supra* 57), **Gian Singh** (*supra* 52) and **N. Raghavender** (*supra* 54), the Court held that the mere existence of a civil dispute, contractual relationship, or availability or invocation of civil remedies such as arbitration, recovery proceedings, settlement, or repayment does not by itself bar or justify quashing of criminal prosecution, since civil and criminal liabilities may coexist, and where the allegations disclose the essential ingredients of a criminal offence, the proceedings must ordinarily be permitted to continue; however, by way of a limited exception, the High Court may, in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., quash proceedings even in non-compoundable offences where the dispute is predominantly civil in nature and has been amicably settled and the possibility of conviction is remote, though such power must be exercised with great caution and is not applicable to serious offences or those affecting society at large.



33. It is relevant to mention that in **Priti Saraf and others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and others**⁶⁶, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reaffirmed that the existence of an arbitration clause or the initiation of arbitral proceedings does not bar or nullify criminal prosecution if the allegations disclose the commission of an offence. Referring to **Trisuns Chemical Industry v. Rajesh Agarwal and Ors**⁶⁷, the Court held that arbitration is a civil remedy for contractual breaches and cannot substitute or override the criminal process where the acts complained of constitute offences under law. An arbitrator has no jurisdiction to try criminal charges, even if they arise out of the same transaction. The Court emphasized that investigation and criminal proceedings should not be pre-empted or quashed merely because an arbitration mechanism exists, except in rare cases where the complaint is patently frivolous or malicious. It further observed that the High Court had erred in failing to consider the charge-sheet on record before concluding that no *prima facie* offence was made out, noting that such issues can only be properly assessed during trial.

34. In the case on hand, there are specific allegations levelled in the complaint that the Corporation entrusted paddy for the specific purpose of CMR and as per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the petitioners/rice mills were required to deliver CMR

⁶⁶ 2021(2) ALT (Cri.) 18 (SC)

⁶⁷ (1999) 8 SCC 686



equivalent to the paddy supplied by the Corporation. However, they failed to deliver the same, and the paddy is also not available with them and the same was misused and misappropriated for their personal gain. These allegations *prima facie* disclose a cognizable offence. Hence, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that respondent No.2 initiated criminal proceedings, without approaching the competent civil Court or without invoking arbitration clause as available under the Agreement filed criminal complaints, is not tenable under law.

35. In respect of other contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the respondent Corporation initiated revenue recovery proceedings against some of the rice mills and aggrieved by the same, they approached this Court and filed W.P.No.17985 of 2024 and batch, and this Court, by order dated 28.08.2024, allowed the said writ petitions and aggrieved thereby, the Corporation/Government has filed Writ Appeals, which are pending before the Hon'ble Division Bench, therefore, the continuation of the proceedings is a clear abuse of the process of law. Whereas, the case of the respondents is that the issues involved in the Writ Appeals and in the present complaints are different and distinct, and that the pendency of the Writ Appeals is not a bar to prosecuting the petitioners under criminal law.



36. It is necessary to extract the operative portion of the order passed in W.P.No.17985 of 2024 and batch:

“27. In the light of the aforesaid discussion, the respondents did not follow the aforesaid procedure laid down under the R.R. Act while issuing destraint order in Form No.1 under Section – 8 of the R.R. Act; demand prior to attachment of land in Form No.4 under Section -25 of the R.R. Act and Notice of attachment in Form No.5 under Section – 27 of the R.R. Act. Therefore, they are liable to be set aside and accordingly the same are set aside. However, this order will not preclude the respondent authorities in initiating proceedings afresh by strictly following the procedure laid down under the R.R. Act and also the principle laid down in the aforesaid judgments.”

37. In the case on hand, there are specific allegations levelled in the complaints that the petitioners, with a dishonest intention, misused and misappropriated the paddy for their personal gain, thereby causing huge financial loss to the Government/Corporation and the issues involved in the Writ Petitions and the Writ Appeals pertain to revenue recovery proceedings. These allegations *prima facie* disclose a cognizable offence. Hence, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the continuation of the criminal proceedings against them is a clear abuse of the process of law, in view of pendency of the Writ Appeals, is not tenable under law.



38. Insofar as the other contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the Corporation supplied substandard paddy, which is not fit for CMR, and supplied excess quantity of paddy are concerned, according to the respondents, the Corporation supplied the paddy and petitioners/rice mills have received the same and at that point of time, the petitioners did not raise any objection with regard to the alleged substandard quality or excess quantity of paddy.

39. It is relevant to extract Clause 5(7) of the Agreement, which reads as under:

“Once the paddy has been accepted through the Truck Chit by the miller, the paddy so received by the miller shall be considered to be correct in terms of quantity and quality and no dispute shall be entertained after such acceptance with regard to the quality and quantity of the paddy received by the miller.”

40. Similarly, Clause 5(8) of the Agreement provides that the Miller agrees to store the paddy received by him/it in his/its registered mill premises or in any other place with the approval of District Collector (CS) in case the receipts exceeded the storage capacity in the mill and it shall remain in the Miller's custody and the Miller will be responsible for any shortage or damage to the paddy/Rice stock.

41. In respect of the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the Corporation is due substantial amounts to the



petitioners/rice mills towards milling charges, gunny bags, storage charges, etc., however, instead of discharging its obligations, the Corporation has made excessive claims against the petitioners and filed the present complaints is concerned, the specific case of the respondents is that the petitioners have not delivered CMR equivalent to the paddy entrusted by the Corporation and there is a shortfall of huge quantity and unless and until the petitioners satisfactorily deliver CMR, they are not entitled to claim the amounts under the above said heads, in view of Clause 12.4 of the Agreement. It is also relevant to extract Clause 12.4 of the Agreement, which reads as under:

“The Second Party shall be entitled to the milling charges at the rates prescribed by the Govt. of India, in the provisional cost sheet for KMS 2022-23 for Telangana state, only after completion of the entire milling operations on satisfactory delivery of rice to FCI or The First Party, and the reconciliation of gunny accounts, paddy accounts and CMR delivery accounts and also after affecting any recovery to be made arising after reconciliation”

42. The core contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that respondent No.2-the District Manager is not competent to lodge the criminal complaint and that as per the sub-Clause 9.1.2(3) of Clause 9.1 of the Agreement, the Commissioner, Civil Supplies Department/VC&MD, TSCSCL alone initiate criminal action against defaulted rice mill and all other concerned, apart from disqualifying



and debarring the rice mill from participating in future CMR operations. Whereas, the specific case of the respondents is that respondent No.2 is competent authority to lodge the complaints. In support of the said contention, the learned Advocate General relied upon a Memo No.704/CS.I-CCS/2016, dated 16.10.2017, whereby Clause 10 stated as follows:

“The District Manager, CSC, shall take action to file a criminal case at the Station House Officers where the defaulter rice mill is existing through the Asst. Manager (Tech.), CSC and Civil Supplies Deputy Tahsildar concerned as complaint Nos.1 and 2.”

43. Learned Advocated General during the course of hearing submitted that the above said Memo is still subsisting and the same is binding upon the parties in terms of Clause 3(a) of the Agreement, which reads as under:

“The Second Party/rice mill agrees to custom mill the paddy of the The First Party/Corporation in accordance with the terms and conditions in this agreement and instructions of the Government/FCI issued from time to time.”

44. In **Ratanlal** (*supra* 47), the Hon'ble Apex Court held in paragraph No.8, which read as follows:

“In Black's Law Dictionary, the meaning assigned to the term “locus standi” is “the right to bring an action or to be heard in a given forum”. One of the meanings assigned to the term “locus standi” in The Law Lexicon of Shri P. Ramanatha



Aiyar, is “a right of appearance in a Court of justice”. The traditional view of locus standi has been that the person who is aggrieved or affected has the standing before the court, that is to say, he only has a right to move the court for seeking justice. The orthodox rule of interpretation regarding the locus standi of a person to reach the court has undergone a sea change with the development of constitutional law in India and the constitutional courts have been adopting a liberal approach in dealing with the cases or dislodging the claim of a litigant merely on hyper technical grounds. It is now well-settled that if the person is found to be not merely a stranger to the case, he cannot be non-suited on the ground of his not having locus standi.”

45. In **Manohar Lal v. Vinesh Anand and Ors.**⁶⁸, this Court has held that the doctrine of locus standi is totally foreign to criminal jurisprudence. To punish an offender in the event of commission of an offence is to subserve a social need. Society cannot afford to have a criminal escape his liability since that would bring about a state of social pollution which is neither desired nor warranted and this is irrespective of the concept of locus.

46. In view of clause 3(a) of the Agreement as well as the Memo dated 16.10.2017 and the principle laid down by the Hon’ble Apex Court in **Ratanlal** (*supra* 47) and **Manohar Lal** (*supra* 68), the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that

⁶⁸ (2001) 5 SCC 407



respondent No.2 is not competent authority to lodge the complaint is not tenable under law.

47. In respect of the other contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that as per the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the Corporation was required to supply only a specified quantity of paddy. However, it supplied excessive quantities contrary to the terms of the Agreement, despite the rice mills lacking adequate storage space. As a result, the excess paddy dumped in the premises of the rice mills was damaged due to heavy rains during the year 2022-2023 and at that stage, the Rice Millers Association made a request to the Government stating that the paddy supplied by the Corporation was not fit for CMR. Accordingly, the Government has taken a decision and conducted an e-tender for the sale of Rabi 2022-2023 FAQ paddy procured under MSP operations by the Corporation through Government of Telangana e-Tender Platform. As per the terms of the e-tender, the paddy stocks were open for physical inspection by interested bidders and were offered on an 'as is where is basis'. Pursuant to the said tender, the successful bidders, after due inspection, participated in the e-tender process and work was awarded to them. Accordingly, the successful bidders lifted the paddy from the premises of the rice mills upon payment of the requisite amount to the respondent Corporation. Therefore, the question of mis-appropriation or diversion of the stock by the



petitioners does not arise and the petitioners are not liable to pay the alleged amounts claimed towards shortfall of paddy, penalty and interest by the Corporation.

48. Whereas, the case of the respondents is that there is no dispute with respect to the entrustment of paddy under KMS 2022-2023 to the petitioners/rice mills and that they have not delivered equivalent quantity of CMR in terms of the Agreement and the petitioners/rice mills did not rise any dispute at the time of supply of the paddy. On the other hand, the petitioners, with a dishonest intention, misused and misappropriated the paddy for their personal and pecuniary gains.

49. Whether the petitioners diverted or misused the paddy entrusted by the Corporation for the specific purpose of CMR with dishonest intention for their personal and pecuniary gain; and whether the successful bidder lifted the entire paddy, along with the other contentions raised by the petitioners are all disputed questions of fact and the same have to be revealed during the course of investigation, especially when the investigation is at a nascent stage, and, therefore, cannot be adjudicated and decided by this Court in a proceedings under Section 528 of the BNSS.

50. In **Sadhupati Nageswara Rao** (*supra* 41) and **K. Bharthi Devi** (*supra* 55), the Court held that to constitute offences such as criminal



breach of trust or cheating, the prosecution must *prima facie* establish the essential ingredients—namely, entrustment and dishonest misappropriation in the case of Section 409 IPC, and fraudulent or dishonest intention at the inception in the case of cheating—and since the existence or absence of such intention is a disputed question of fact requiring evidence, the proceedings cannot be quashed at the threshold under Section 482 Cr.P.C. merely on the ground that the dispute appears to be civil in nature.

51. It is relevant to mention that in **Mahendra K.C. v. State of Karnataka and others**⁶⁹, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that while exercising powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the High Court must not act as a trial or appellate court by weighing evidence or testing the truth of allegations. At the quashing stage, the only test is whether the allegations in the compliant, taken at face value, *prima facie* make out the ingredients of the alleged offence. It is further clarified that the High Court should apply two key tests while considering quashing of an FIR (i) whether the allegations, if taken as true, *prima facie* constitute an offence, and (ii) whether they are so improbable that no reasonable person could conclude that sufficient ground exists to proceed.

⁶⁹ (2022) 2 SCC 129



52. The other contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the offence under Section 316(5) of the BNS is not attracted against the petitioners, as they do not fall within the meaning of 'agent' as envisaged under Section 182 of the Contract Act, 1872, is concerned, there are specific allegations levelled in the complaint that the petitioners/rice mills and Corporation entered into an Agreement and pursuant to the said Agreement, the Corporation/Government entrusted a particular quantity of paddy for a specific purpose i.e., CMR. However, the petitioners/rice mills have not delivered the CMR equivalent to the paddy supplied by the Corporation, on the other hand, the petitioners, with a dishonest intention diverted, misused and misappropriated the paddy for their personal and pecuniary gains and thereby caused huge loss to the Corporation/Government.

53. In **Som Nath Puri v. State of Rajasthan**⁷⁰, the Hon'ble Supreme Court gave a wide and purposive interpretation to the expression "entrusted in any manner," holding that entrustment arises whenever property is handed over or comes into the possession of an accused in his official or fiduciary capacity for a specific purpose, even if such possession is initially procured by deception, and that dominion over such property, followed by dishonest misappropriation, constitutes criminal breach of trust.

⁷⁰(1972) 1 SCC 630



54. In **Narindra Kumar Jain v. State of M.P.**⁷¹, the Hon'ble Supreme Court affirmed the conviction under Section 409 IPC, holding that criminal breach of trust is established where an accused, in a position of responsibility, fails to account for entrusted property and resorts to falsification of records to conceal misappropriation; the Court underscored that verified shortages proved through reliable evidence, coupled with false explanations, are sufficient to sustain conviction.

55. In **S. Sadashiva Rao v. State of A.P. and another**⁷², the erstwhile of High Court of Judicature of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad, while relying upon the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Soma Nath Puri** (*supra* 70) held that the expression 'entrustment' in Section 409 of the IPC is used in a wider sense and includes all cases in which the property is handed over for a specific purpose and is dishonestly dispossessed contrary to the terms on which the possession has been handed over and further held in paragraph No.11, which reads as follows:

"In the instant case also, on behalf of the Visakhapatnam Steel Plant. P.W.I. has entrusted a total quantity of 41,640 metric tonnes of steel by work order dt. 31-12-1987 and 5-1-1988 for specific purpose of fabrication and erection of trolley in two instalments on 25-3-1988 and 6-5-1988, and the work had to be completed before 20-3-1988.

⁷¹(1996 SCC (Cri) 1025)

⁷² 2002 (1) ALD (Cri.) 393 (AP)



When the accused failed to execute the above said work, time was further extended. Thus, when the steel was entrusted to the accused for a specific purpose, he has dishonestly disposed it of contrary to the terms on which possession was handed over to him. Though the accused is an independent contractor and has to use his own means to complete the contract, in view of the wider sense given to the term Agent by the Supreme Court which include all cases in which property is voluntarily handed over for specific purpose, under Section 409 of the Penal Code, 1860 he can be treated as an agent. When the accused has not completed the work of contract, and he failed to account the steel entrusted to him, he has dishonestly and fraudulently misappropriated the steel entrusted by P.W.I. Thus, the accused is guilty of the criminal breach of trust and, therefore, he is liable to be punished for the offence under Section 409 of the Penal Code, 1860, inasmuch as, the accused as an agent on behalf of his Principal — P.W.I. has misappropriated the steel entrusted to him. Therefore, it cannot be said that the order passed by the court below is illegal and contrary to law. Therefore the conviction was confirmed."

56. Applying the aforesaid settled principles to the present case, the contention of the petitioners that they do not fall within the ambit of Section 316(5) BNS is misconceived. The execution of the agreement and the admitted entrustment of Government paddy clearly establish a relationship of agency coupled with dominion over property. The petitioners, having entered into a contractual arrangement for custom milling, received paddy procured under the MSP scheme, which at all times remained the property of the



Corporation, and were under a binding obligation to convert and return the equivalent CMR. Such entrustment for a specific purpose squarely attracts Section 316(5) BNS, which encompasses cases where a person, being in any manner entrusted with property or having dominion over it in the capacity of an agent, commits breach of trust. The admitted receipt of substantial quantities of paddy, the fiduciary nature of possession, and the significant unexplained shortages revealed during inspection *prima facie* demonstrate that the petitioners exercised dominion over the property and failed to duly account for it. The mere characterization of the transaction as “job work” does not detract from the legal effect of entrustment, as it is the existence of control coupled with an obligation to return or account that is determinative. Accordingly, the petitioners, by virtue of contractual entrustment and resultant dominion over Government property, fall squarely within the ambit of Section 316(5) BNS, consistent with the principles laid down in the aforesaid decisions.

57. In respect of other contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners is that all the Clauses of the Agreement are one sided and in favour of Corporation and there are blanks in the Agreement and the dates were also not mentioned is concerned, the Agreement was entered by both the parties in the year 2022-23 and this Court is of the *prima facie* view that the valid of the Agreement cannot be adjudicated and decided in a proceedings under Section 528 of the



BNSS, especially the ground raised by the petitioners is a disputed fact.

58. In **Bihar State Electricity Board** (*supra* 46), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that contractual terms must be interpreted holistically by reading the agreement as a whole to ascertain the true intention of the parties, and that standard form contracts are enforceable if they are fair and not opposed to public policy; hence, selective reliance on a single clause in isolation cannot justify quashing, as the matter requires a complete and contextual examination of the contract, and therefore quashing of the proceedings is not permissible when investigation is at the threshold stage.

59. Insofar as the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.P.No.2809 of 2026 that the alleged inspection was conducted on 16.10.2025, the report was submitted on 27.10.2025, and that the present complaint was lodged on 23.02.2026 after a lapse of nearly four months, and on the said ground, the complaint is liable to be quashed is concerned, merely on the ground of delay in lodging the complaint, the petitioner is not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings at the threshold, particularly when the State Government/Corporation has adopted a welfare oriented policy of procuring paddy from farmers at the MSP and entrusted the same to



the petitioners/Rice Mills under the Agreement for CMR, however, the petitioners failed to deliver the equivalent quantity of CMR to the Corporation/Government as agreed and on the contrary, diverted the same for personal gain, thereby causing huge financial loss to the Government/Corporation and affecting public interest.

60. It is relevant to mention that in **Sarah Mathew v. Institute of Cardio- Vascular Diseases**⁷³, the constitutional Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has specifically held that the period of limitation is to be calculated from the date of filing of the complaint or charge-sheet, not from the date of the FIR or the date of cognizance. The Court further clarified that the bar of limitation not affect the investigation process. In **Assistant Collector of Customs v. L.R. Melwani**⁷⁴, the constitutional Bench of the Hon'ble Apex court has observed that mere delay in filing a complaint cannot by itself be a ground to quash proceedings and may only be considered during trial. In **Vanka Radhamanohari v. Vanka Venkata Reddy**⁷⁵, the Hon'ble Apex court also held that when any of the offences alleged is punishable with imprisonment of more than three years, the entire prosecution is outside the scope of limitation.

⁷³ (2014) 2 SCC 62

⁷⁴ 1968 SCC OnLine SC 161

⁷⁵ (1993) 3 SCC 4



61. In **Hasmukhlal D. Vora and another v. State of Tamil Nadu**⁷⁶, the Hon'ble Apex Court while referring to the judgment **Bijoy Singh v. State of Bihar**⁷⁷ held that where inordinate and unexplained delay in prosecution can indicate mala fide intent and be fatal to the case. When there is no explanation offered for the delay, leading the court to infer a possible sinister motive. Emphasizing that criminal proceeding must serve justice and not be used to harass, the Court quashed the complaint proceedings pending in the Metropolitan Magistrate's Court. In the case on hand, the issue of delay in lodging the complaint is a matter for investigation and trial, it cannot be decided at this stage, as there are specific allegations against the petitioners.

62. In **Shantaben Bhurabhai Bhuriya v. Anand Athabhai Chaudhari and others**⁷⁸, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that a delay in lodging an FIR or complaint cannot by itself be a ground to quash criminal proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The Court clarified that the issue of delay is a matter of evidence to be examined during trial, where the complainant can be questioned about and explain the reasons for such delay during cross-examination. Therefore, the mere fact that the FIR or complaint was filed belatedly does not justify the quashing of proceedings at the threshold; as such

⁷⁶ 2023 (1) ALT (Cr.) 102 (SC)

⁷⁷ (2002) 9 SCC 147

⁷⁸ 2021 (3) ALT (Cr.) 480 (SC)



determinations require appreciation of facts and evidence, which falls within the domain of the trial court.

63. It is also relevant to mention that in cases involving misuse or misappropriation of public funds and welfare-oriented procurement schemes, delay in lodging the complaint by itself does not vitiate the criminal proceedings, particularly when the allegations pertain to misappropriation of huge quantity of paddy entrusted by the Corporation for a specific purpose under the Agreement and non-delivery of CMR equivalent to the paddy so entrusted. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the Crimes on the ground of delay in lodging the complaints at this stage.

64. With regard to the other contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners that even according to the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the employees of the Corporation are also liable for prosecution in view Clause 10 of the Agreement, which deals with 'joint custody'. However, respondent No.2 has lodged the complaints against the petitioners/rice mills, without implicating their employees as accused. According to the respondents, the role of the employees of the Corporation is very limited only for inspection of the records and stocks during the currency of the Agreement.



65. It is further relevant to mention that mere non-inclusion of the employees of the Corporation as accused is not fatal to the prosecution and the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings on the said ground. Whether there is any conspiracy between the employees of the Corporation and the petitioners regarding the alleged diversion of paddy and misappropriation and there is any role of the employees of the Corporation in the crimes, the same will be revealed during the course of investigation, especially the investigation is at threshold.

66. It is relevant to mention that the scope of the present criminal petition is very limited, whether the allegations levelled in the complaint *prima facie* discloses cognizable offences which attract the ingredients of the offences under Sections 316(2), 316(5) and 318(3) of the BNS and Section 7 of the E.C. Act or not; whether the petitioners are entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings at crime stage or not. It is already stated *supra* that there are specific allegations levelled against the petitioners in the complaint that the petitioners have not delivered CMR equivalent to the paddy which was entrusted for specific purpose as per the Agreement and is dishonestly and fraudulently misappropriated and diverted the paddy for their personal and pecuniary gain. The said allegations *prima facie* disclose cognizable offences. Whether the allegations levelled in



the complaint are true or not can only be revealed during the course of investigation, especially the investigation is at threshold.

67. The judgments relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioners in **Ashok Kumar** (*supra* 34), **Atluri Sitaramdas** (*supra* 9), **Sadhupati Nageswara Rao** (*supra* 41), **Sushil Sethi** (*supra* 6), **Inder Chand Bagri** (*supra* 12), **Satishchandra Ratanlal Shah** (*supra* 14), **S.N. Vijayalakshmi** (*supra* 16), **Vandana Jain** (*supra* 36), **Hridaya Ranjan Prasad Verma** (*supra* 27), and **Sharad Kumar Sanghi** (*supra* 7), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that mere breach of contract, non-performance of obligations, or civil disputes cannot be given a criminal colour unless the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are clearly established. For offences like cheating (Sections 415/420 IPC), dishonest or fraudulent intention must exist at the very inception of the transaction, while for criminal breach of trust (Sections 405/406/409 IPC), there must be specific entrustment coupled with dishonest misappropriation and *mens rea*, and in the case of Section 409, such entrustment must be in a fiduciary capacity of a specified category. The judgments further emphasize that vicarious liability cannot be presumed without specific allegations, and that civil disputes, partnership issues, or contractual breaches, in the absence of criminal intent, do not attract penal consequences. Accordingly, where allegations are vague, lack essential ingredients, or are initiated to harass or exert pressure, the



Courts are duty-bound, while exercising powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C./ Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to look beyond the mere averments and quash such proceedings to prevent abuse of process of law and secure the ends of justice

67.1. In **Mahmood Ali** (*supra* 17), **Sujoy Ghosh** (*supra* 3), **Rajiv Thapar** (*supra*), and **Sri Gulam Mustafa** (*supra* 62), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that, while exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the High Court is not confined to a mere reading of the FIR or complaint, but is required to undertake a holistic and pragmatic evaluation of the entire material on record. If, upon such examination, the Court finds that the criminal proceedings are manifestly frivolous, vexatious, or malicious, or are instituted with ulterior motives such as to wreak personal vengeance or to give a criminal colour to a civil dispute or where unimpeachable material of sterling quality placed on record clearly demolishes the prosecution case, the Court would be justified in exercising its inherent jurisdiction to quash the proceedings, notwithstanding that the allegations in the complaint may *prima facie* disclose the ingredients of an offence, so as to prevent abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice.



67.2. In **Anukul Singh** (*supra* 22), **A.M. Mohan** (*supra* 13), **Rajib Ranjan** (*supra* 18), **Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd.** (*supra* 21), and **Kailash Verma** (*supra* 61), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that criminal law cannot be invoked as a tool of harassment, private vendetta, or coercion in disputes which are essentially civil or contractual in nature, and mere allegations of breach of contract, non-payment, or commercial default do not constitute criminal offences unless the essential ingredients of the alleged offence are clearly established, such as dishonest intention at the inception in cases of cheating or entrustment coupled with dishonest misappropriation in cases of criminal breach of trust; it is further emphasized that initiation of criminal proceedings alongside civil remedies or through multiple or successive FIRs is indicative of mala fide intent and abuse of process, and in the absence of specific and cogent allegations demonstrating active involvement and criminal intent, continuation of such proceedings is legally unsustainable and liable to be quashed to prevent misuse of the criminal justice system.

67.3. In **Delhi Race Club (1940) Ltd** (*supra* 15), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that: Cheating and criminal breach of trust are distinct and mutually exclusive offences. Cheating requires dishonest intention from the very beginning of the transaction, whereas criminal breach of trust arises when property is lawfully entrusted but later dishonestly misappropriated. Hence, both offences generally



cannot coexist on the same facts, and authorities must carefully distinguish between them.

68. The reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners in paragraph Nos.66.1 to 66.3 are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case. In those cases, the disputes were purely civil in nature, arising out of breaches of contract without any allegation of fraudulent or dishonest intent at the inception. However, in the present case, there are specific allegations of entrustment of paddy and failure to deliver CMR equivalent to the paddy entrusted by the Corporation. It is further alleged that the petitioners misappropriated and diverted the paddy for their personal gains, which if accepted at face value, discloses the ingredients of the offences alleged against them.

69. The judgments relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioners in **Jayalakshmi Rice Mill Contractors C.** (*supra* 5), **Lakshminarayan Ram Gopal and Son Ltd.** (*supra* 33) and **Krishna Bhatta** (*supra* 37), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the true test of an agency relationship is not mere employment, payment of commission, or performance of assigned work, but the existence of authority to act on behalf of the principal and to create or affect legal relations with third parties. The distinction primarily turns on the degree of control and the presence of independent discretion: a servant is subject to complete control and supervision not only as to



what work is to be done but also how it is to be done; an agent, though bound by instructions, retains independence in the manner of performance and possesses a representative character enabling him to bind the principal; whereas a person who merely acts under directions, without any such authority or discretion, is only a licensee or instrumentality. Thus, authority to bind the principal, representative capacity, and the extent of control versus independence are the determinative factors in identifying the true nature of the relationship.

69.1. In **UCO Bank** (*supra* 32), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that a bailee has only custody/possession of goods without any authority to represent or bind the bailor, whereas an agent has representative authority to create legal relations on behalf of the principal; thus, bailment lacks the element of representation essential to agency.

69.2. In **Baldeo Narain Singh** (*supra* 35), the Patna High Court held that when goods are given for a specific purpose and ownership remains with the giver, the receiver becomes a bailee under the Indian Contract Act 1872. The bailee must use the goods only for that purpose, take reasonable care, and return or deal with them as agreed—otherwise, he is liable for breach of bailment or misappropriation.

69.3. In **Bal Kishan Das** (*supra* 11) and **Laxmi Nr. Sah** (*supra* 10), it is held that where a dispute arises out of a contractual relationship



especially when civil remedies or arbitration are available or already invoked it remains purely civil in nature, and mere allegations of breach, shortage, or non-performance do not constitute a criminal offence. For offences like criminal breach of trust (Sections 406/409 IPC), there must be clear proof of entrustment, dishonest misappropriation, and mens rea; in their absence, the dispute cannot be given a criminal colour. The Courts have emphasized that invoking criminal proceedings in such circumstances, especially when civil or arbitral remedies are available or pending, amounts to abuse of the process of law, and such proceedings are liable to be quashed to secure the ends of justice.

70. The reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners in paragraph Nos.68.1 to 68.3 are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case, as the Corporation entrusted the paddy for a specific purpose in terms of the Agreement and the petitioners dishonestly diverted and misappropriated the same for their personal gains. These allegations *prima facie* fall within the ambit of criminal breach of trust.

71. In **Kishan Singh** (*supra* 20) and **Dilawar Singh** (*supra* 26), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that lodging of an FIR is a crucial safeguard ensuring the spontaneity and authenticity of the prosecution case. Unexplained or inordinate delaying registration of the FIR raises serious doubt of embellishment, deliberation, or



fabrication. Such delay must be satisfactorily explained, failing which it undermines the credibility of the prosecution and may, in appropriate cases, prove fatal. Further, where the delay appears deliberate or mala fide, aimed at harassment or vengeance, the criminal proceedings amount to an abuse of process of law, justifying interference and quashing by the Court.

72. The reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners in **Kishan Singh** (*supra* 20) and **Dilwar Singh** (*supra* 26) are is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case on the ground that in the said cases relied upon there was inordinate and unexplained delay, whereas in the present cases, there is no such delay in lodging the complaint, more particularly, in the present cases huge quantity of the paddy purchased by the Government from the farmers under MSP, entrusted through the Corporation to the petitioners/rice mills for CMR. However, the petitioners failed to deliver the CMR as per the Agreement and are alleged to have diverted for their personal gains, as a result of which, the Government/Corporation has sustained huge financial loss.

73. In **S.K. Bhargava** (*supra* 28), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that even though the statute does not expressly provide for an opportunity of hearing, the principles of natural justice must be read into it, as the power to "determine" the "sum due" implies the existence of a lis; therefore, the authority is bound to give notice and



an opportunity of hearing to the affected party, and any determination made without such opportunity is vitiated in law.

74. The above said judgment in **S.K. Bhargava** (*supra* 28) relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioners is not applicable to the present facts and circumstances of the case, especially the invocation of an arbitration clause is a civil remedy for contractual breaches and cannot substitute or override the criminal process where the acts complained of constitute offences under law an arbitrator has no jurisdiction to try criminal charges, even if they arise out of the same transaction.

75. In **J. Shri Kersi H. Vachha** (*supra* 4), **Suresh Singh** (*supra* 24), and **N. Gopinath** (*supra* 8), the courts have held that a criminal proceeding is maintainable only when it satisfies both procedural and substantive legal requirements it must be instituted by a duly authorized person in strict compliance with statutory provisions, and the complaint must contain clear, specific averments disclosing all essential ingredients of the offence. Any defect in authorization, procedural non-compliance, non-impleadment of necessary parties (e.g., company), or vague allegations in a predominantly civil dispute renders the proceedings unsustainable and an abuse of process, justifying quashing by the court.

76. The reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioners in **J. Shri Kersi H. Vachha** (*supra* 4), **Suresh Singh** (*supra* 24), and **N.**



Gopinath (*supra* 8) are not applicable to the present facts and circumstances of the case, in view of Clause 3(a) of the Agreement, wherein it is stipulated that the instructions issued by the Government/FCI from time to time are binding upon the parties to the Agreement. The Government had issued Memo dated 16.10.2017, wherein Clause 10 authorizes the District Manager, CSC, to initiate criminal action against the defaulter rice mills.

77. The contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners in Crl.P.Nos.3074, 3145 and 3587 of 2026 are that the petitioners had submitted their resignations to their respective positions even prior to the execution of the Agreement between the Corporation and the Rice Millers and the same were accepted by their respective Companies as well as the competent authority and that they are not the parties to the said Agreement. Hence, the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioners is a clear abuse of the process of law. Whereas, respondent No.2 in his counter has denied the same and contended that mere resignation on paper does not absolve criminal liability, particularly when there are specific allegations regarding the entrustment of paddy and subsequent misappropriation of the said paddy. Whether the allegations levelled in the complaint against the petitioners are true or not, whether the petitioners are having any role in the respective Rice Mills or not by virtue of their resignations enclosed along with



the criminal petitions; and whether any other material exists to connect the petitioners with the alleged crime are to be revealed during the course of investigation, especially the investigation is at threshold and the grounds which were raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners are purely disputed questions of facts and same cannot be adjudicated at this stage.

78. Insofar as the other submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners that in similar circumstances, this Court, while disposing of the Criminal Petition Nos.12037 of 2024 dated 03.10.2024, 895 of 2024 dated 25.01.2024 and 1461 of 2022 dated 07.06.2022, directed the Investigating Officer to follow the due procedure as contemplated under Section 41-A of Cr.P.C./Section 35(3) of the BNSS and the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar** (*supra* 23) and the petitioners are also entitled to the very same benefit is concerned, the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioners constitute cognizable offences and the punishment prescribed for the offences levelled in the complaints is more than seven years. Once this Court comes to the conclusion that it is not a fit case to quash the proceedings, it does not have the power to issued a direction to the Investigating Officer to follow the procedure as contemplated under Section 35(3) of the BNSS and the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Arnesh Kumar** (*supra* 23).



79. In **Bhajan Lal** (*supra* 51), the Hon'ble Supreme Court delineated the limited scope of the High Court's jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution and Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash criminal proceedings, holding that such power may be exercised only in exceptional cases where the allegations, even if taken at face value, do not disclose any offence, are inherently improbable, legally barred, or manifestly mala fide, while cautioning that the categories so enumerated are illustrative and the power must be exercised sparingly.

80. The above said principles were reiterated in **Neeharika Infrastructure (P) Ltd.** (*supra* 29), wherein it was emphasised that the police have a statutory right and duty to investigate cognizable offences and that Courts should not interdict investigation at the threshold unless no cognizable offence is disclosed on a plain reading of the FIR; the FIR is not expected to be an encyclopedia of all facts, and criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at their nascent stage. In the present case, the allegations made in the complaint *prima facie* disclose cognizable offences, and as the investigation is still in progress, the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings at the threshold.

81. It is already stated *supra* that there are specific allegations levelled in the complaints that the petitioners/Rice Mills have not delivered CMR equivalent to the paddy entrusted by the Corporation



for specific purpose as per the Agreement and they dishonestly and fraudulently misappropriated and diverted the paddy for their personal and pecuniary gains. The said allegations prima facie disclose cognizable offences and require investigation. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings especially the investigation is at threshold.

82. For the foregoing reasons as well as the precedent decisions, this Court does not find any ground to quash the proceedings by exercising the powers conferred under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C./Section 528 of the BNSS and the same are liable to be dismissed.

83. Accordingly, all the criminal petitions are hereby dismissed.

Miscellaneous applications, pending if any, shall stand closed.

**SD/- MOHD.ISMAIL
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

One Fair Copy to the Hon'ble Sri Justice J SREENIVAS RAO
(For His Lordships Kind Perusal)

To,

1. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Nakrekal.
2. The Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Bodhan.
3. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Bichkunda.
4. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Banswada.
5. The Additional Junior Civil Judge-Spl. Judicial First Class (Mobile) Magistrate at Kamareddy.
6. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Kamareddy.
7. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Yellareddy.
8. The Judicial First Class Magistrate (Special Mobile) Court at Nalgonda.
9. The III Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-III Additional Magistrate of First Class at



Nalgonda.

10. The Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Bodhan.
11. The II Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Nizamabad.
12. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Narayankhed.
13. The VI Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Warangal.
14. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Atmakur.
15. The III Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Nalgonda.
16. The Judicial First Class Magistrate (Special Mobile) Court at Khammam.
17. The Judicial First Class Magistrate at Nalgonda.
18. The Station House Officer, Nizamabad Rural Police Station, Nizamabad.
19. The Station House Officer, Nalgonda II Town Police Station, Nalgonda.
20. The Station House Officer, Chityal Police Station, Nalgonda.
21. The Station House Officer, Bhainsa Rural Police Station, Nirmal.
22. The Station House Officer, Kothakota Police Station, Wanaparthy.
23. The Station House Officer, Bhainsa Rural Police Station, Nirmal.
24. The Station House Officer, Kotagiri Police Station, Nizamabad.
25. The Station House Officer, Nasrullabad Police Station, Kamareddy.
26. The Station House Officer, Machareddy Police Station, Kamareddy.
27. The Station House Officer, Kethapally Police Station, Nalgonda.
28. The Station House Officer, Kataram Police Station, Jayashankar Bhupally District.
29. The Station House Officer, Nelakondapalli Police Station, Khammam.
30. The Station House Officer, Nalgonda Rural Police Station, Nalgonda.
31. The Station House Officer, Narsapur Police Station, Nirmal.
32. The Station House Officer, Yergatla, Nizamabad.
33. The Station House Officer, Mungode Police Station, Nalgonda.
34. The Station House Officer, Varni Police Station, Nizamabad.
35. The Station House Officer, Sirgapur Police Station, Sangareddy.
36. The Station House Officer, Pitlam Police Station, Kamareddy.
37. The Station House Officer, Nizamsagar Police Station, Kamareddy.
38. The Station House Officer, Thangallapalli Police Station, Rajanna Sircilla.
39. The Station House Officer, Sadasiva Nagar Police Station, Kamareddy.
40. The Station House Officer, Machareddy Police Station, Kamareddy.
41. The Station House Officer, Yellareddy Police Station, Kamareddy.
42. The Station House Officer, Ramareddy Police Station, Kamareddy.



2026:TSHC:15766

43. The Station House Officer, Birkur Police Station, Kamareddy.
44. The Station House Officer, Nagireddypet Police Station, Kamareddy.
45. The Station House Officer, Lingampet Police Station, Kamareddy.
46. The Station House Officer, Madnoor Police Station, Kamareddy.
47. The Station House Officer, Bichkunda Police Station, Kamareddy.
48. The Station House Officer, Rajam Pet Police Station, Kamareddy.
49. The Station House Officer, Jukkal Police Station, Kamareddy.
50. The Station House Officer, Sultanabad Police Station, Ramagundam.
51. The Station House Officer, Bodhan Rural Police Station, Nizamabad.
52. The Station House Officer, Sirpur -T Police Station, Kumuram Bheem Asifabad District.
53. The Station House Officer, Ghanpur Police Station, Wanaparthy District.
54. One CC to Sri K.Venumadhav, Advocate [OPUC]
55. One CC to Sri Praveen Kumar Veerajala, Advocate [OPUC]
56. One CC to Sri K.Buchibabu, Advocate [OPUC]
57. One CC to Sri N.Manohar, Advocate [OPUC]
58. One CC to Sri Kavadi Naresh, Advocate [OPUC]
59. One CC to Sri Lohit Sannapaneni, Advocate [OPUC]
60. One CC to Sri Keerthi Simha, Advocate [OPUC]
61. One CC to Sri C.Haripreeth, Advocate [OPUC]
62. One CC to Sri V.Ramesh Kumar, Advocate [OPUC]
63. One CC to Sri Bhargav Krishna,L. Advocate [OPUC]
64. One CC to Sri Chalakani Venkat Yadav, Advocate [OPUC]
65. One CC to Sri Somavarapu Satyanarayana, Advocate [OPUC]
66. One CC to Mrs. Devineni Radha Rani, Advocate [OPUC]
67. One CC to Sri K.Durag Prasad, Advocate [OPUC]
68. One CC to Sri Banda Prasada Rao, Advocate [OPUC]
69. One CC to Sri Gujjula Madhusudhan, Advocate [OPUC]
70. One CC to Sri Venkataramanaiah.K, Advocate [OPUC]
71. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
72. Two CCs to Advocate General, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad [OUT]
73. 11 LR Copies.
74. The Under Secretary, Union of India Ministry of law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi
75. The Secretary Telangana Advocates Association, Library, High Court Buildings Hyderabad.
76. Two CD Copies.

JCK/KA

CHP



2026:TSHC:15766

HIGH COURT

DATED: 05/05/2026



COMMON ORDER

CRLP.Nos.2809, 957, 981, 1620, 2608, 2818, 2853, 2856, 2857, 2917, 2928, 2944, 3028, 3029, 3074, 3142, 3143, 3144, 3145, 3206, 3426, 3433, 3587, 3921, 4024, 4027, 4058, 4145, 4249, 4250, 4255, 4256, 4257, 4259, 4260, 4261, 4316, 4361, 4383, 4482, 4483, 4485, 4486, 4558, 4559, 4624, 4660, 4662, 4781, 5194, 5220, 5252, 5505, 5986, 6057, 6251, 6385 AND 6863 OF 2026

Dismissing all the Criminal Petitions.

(100) CHR
01/06/26