

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

**THURSDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J SREENIVAS RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 8480 OF 2026

Between:

Mohammad Saadaq, S/o. Mohammad Sahab, Age 42 years, Occ. Business,
R/o. H.No.1-66/35/A/S, NTR Colony, Darpally Town & Mandal, Nizamabad
District, Telangana State.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by the Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana.
2. G. Rajeshwar, S/o. Rajanna, Age.53 yrs, Occ. MRI, Darpally, R/o. H.No.4-62, Khanapur, Nizamabad Town AND District.

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. 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 CC No. 1666 of 2025 on the file of the V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Nizamabad in so far as petitioner/Accused.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. 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 in CC No. 1666 of 2025 on the file of the V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Nizamabad 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 Alluri Divakar Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner and Sri Jithender Rao Veeramalla, Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and none appeared for Respondent No.2.

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J.SREENIVAS RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8480 of 2026

Date: 11.06.2026

Between:

Mohammed Saadaq

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana and another

...Respondents

ORDER

This Criminal Petition has been filed by petitioner seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.1666 of 2025 on the file of the V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Nizambad.

2. Heard Mr.Alluri Divakar Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Jithender Rao Veeramalla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1.

3. The specific allegation against the petitioner/accused is that he has procured PDS rice from the beneficiaries at cheaper rate to sell the same for profit and on 21.09.2025, the petitioner was found in possession of 01.59 quintals of PDS rice.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that without there being any complaint from any beneficiary, alleging that the

rice was procured deceptively or with a criminal intent and charging the petitioner for prosecution is untenable and improper. The allegations, even taken at his face value cannot be sustained against the petitioner. Further, this Court, in CrI.P.No.5709 of 2019, while considering the same situation, categorically observed that the offences alleged against the petitioners therein could not be continued and accordingly quashed the proceedings. The petitioner is also entitled to the same relief and hence prayed to quash the proceedings against the petitioner.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that as per prosecution, the offences said to have been committed by the petitioner is cheating and violation of Section 7 of the EC Act and requested to pass appropriate orders.

6. Section 7 of the EC Act contemplate that any person contravenes with the production, supply, distribution and trade of essential commodities, is punishable. As per the prosecution, the petitioner has procured PDS rice from the beneficiaries after supply from the dealer.

7. A Coordinate Bench of this Court in CrI.P.No.7227 of 2025 has considered the identical facts and observed that:

"There is no averment indicating that the petitioner in any way deceptively induced the beneficiaries to part with the supplied PDS rice or the beneficiary entrusted the PDS rice purchased by them with the petitioner and they dishonestly misappropriated or converted to their own use or used it in violation of a lawful direction or contract. In the absence of essential factors, on the face of prosecution, this Court finds it to be a fit case to exercise the jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023. Thus, continuance of proceedings against the petitioner is abuse of process of law".

8. The facts and circumstances of the present case also similar to those in the above case and hence, this Court finds it to be a fit case to exercise jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS by applying the same analogy and to quash the proceedings against the petitioner herein.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed and the proceedings in C.C.No.1666 of 2025 on the file of the V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Nizambad, against the petitioner/accused, are hereby quashed.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

**SD/- A.H.S.GOWRI SHANKAR
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Nizamabad
2. The Station House Officer Police Station Dharpally, Nizamabad District.
3. One CC to Sri Alluri Divakar Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
5. Two CD Copies

4/1

HIGH COURT

DATED: 11/06/2026

ORDER

CRLP.No.8480 of 2026



ALLOWING THE CRIMINAL PETITION

8/MT
22/6/26