



[3444]

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

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 11455 OF 2025

Between:

1. Mohammed Quadeer Ahmed alias Mohammad Qadeer,, S/o. Wazeer Ahmed, aged about 65 years, Occ.. Retired, R/o. H.No.8-1-40/1/A, B, C, D, 8 E H S Royal, Flat No.302, Seven Tombs Road, Samatha Colony, Golconda, Hyderabad, T.G.
2. Rehana alias Rehana Begum, W/o. Mohammed Quadeer Ahmed, aged about 60 years, Occ.. Household, R/o. Flat No.94, Block No.9, Asian Towers, Hi-tech Colony, Mancheria, Telangana - 504208.

Both are presently residing at Ubadah Ibn Alsamit Street, Ar Rawdah, 3645 (Beside. Khaled Shaman Stationery), Ground Floor, Flat -03, Riyadh 13211-8294, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Petitioners No.1 & 2/Accused No.2 & 3 are represented by its GPA holder Mohammed Abdul Qayyum, S/o. Abdus Salam, aged about 47 years, occ. Business, R/ o. H.No. 9-2-410/D/11, Bagdad Colony, Langar Houz, Hyderabad-500008.

...PETITIONER No. 1 & 2/ACCUSED No. 2 & 3.

AND

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

...RESPONDENT NO.1/COMPLAINANT

2. Smt Neha Firdose, W/o Mohammed Ashad D/o Faizuddin taher aged about 27 years Occ Househld R/o 1-13-230/A Noorani Masjid Easgaon Road Kaghaznagar

...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 in connection with Crime No.22 of 2025 dated 03-02-2025 on the file of Kaghaznagar Town, K.B. Asifabad District, against the Petitioners No.1 and 2/Accused No.2 and 3



2025:TSHC:40531

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2025

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 appearance of the Petitioner in connection with Crime No.22 of 2025 dated 03-02-2025 on the file of P.S. Kaghaznagar Town, K.B Asifabad District, against the Petitioners No.1 and 2/Accused No.2 and 3

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Mohammad Naseer Pasha ,Advocate for the Petitioners and Sri. Jithender Rao Veeramalla, the Additional Public Prosecutor for the State of Telangana on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and none appeared for the Respondent No. 2

The Court made the following: ORDER



2025:TSHC:40531

THE HONOURABLE Smt.JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11455 of 2025

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed by the petitioners-accused Nos.2 and 3 seeking to quash the proceedings in FIR No.22 of 2025 on the file of the Kaghaznagar Town Police Station, Kumarambheem Asifabad District, for the offences under Sections 498-A IPC and 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act (for short 'DP Act').

2. Heard Sri Mohammad Naseer Pasha, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Jithender Rao Veeramalla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent No.1-State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are the parents-in-law of the de facto complainant and that they never resided with the de facto complainant and never harassed her. He further submitted that they are residing in Riyadh at Saudi Arabia and that there are no specific allegations against them and hence, prayed to quash the proceedings against the petitioners.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has submitted that during her stay of one month at her in-laws house, her in-laws

harassed her and snatched away her cell phone and did not allow her to talk with her parents.

5. Perused the record.

6. The record discloses that the de facto complainant went along with her husband to Qatar after marriage and after two months of her stay, she was sent back to India and on arriving in India, she went to her in-laws house and stayed there for about a month. The allegation leveled against the petitioners is that they harassed her and they have not allowed her to talk to her parents over cell phone. This is the only averment against the petitioners herein. The allegations of harassment mostly refer to her husband-accused No.1. The specific allegation against the petitioners is that they have not allowed her to talk to her parents on cell phone. But for this, all the other allegations referred to the harassment made by her husband-accused No.1. Admittedly, the petitioners herein are residents of Riyadh. Even assuming that she had stayed for a month with the in-laws, there are no specific incidents of harassment except the bald statement that they have not allowed her to talk to her parents. In **Digambar v. State of Maharashtra**¹, it was alleged that the parents used to instigate their son (husband of the complainant)

¹ 2024 LawSuit (SC) 1196



against the complainant therein, the Apex Court has discussed the decision laid down in **Dara Laxminarayana v. State of Telangana [2024 INSC 953]** and also **State of Haryana v. Bhajanlal [1992 Supp (1) SCC 335]** and held as follows:

"The inclusion of Section 498A of the IPC by way of an amendment was intended to curb cruelty inflicted on a woman by her husband and his family, ensuring swift intervention by the State. However, in recent years, as there has been a notable rise in matrimonial disputes across the country, accompanied by growing discord and tension within the institution of marriage, consequently, there has been a growing tendency to misuse provisions like Section 498A of the IPC as a tool for unleashing personal vendetta against the husband and his family. Making vague and generalized allegations during matrimonial conflicts, if not scrutinized, will lead to the misuse of legal processes and an encouragement for use of arm twisting tactics by a wife and/or her family. Sometimes, recourse is taken to invoke Section 498A of the IPC against the husband and his family in order to seek compliance with the unreasonable demands of a wife. Consequently, this Court has, time and again, cautioned against prosecuting the husband and his family in the absence of a clear prima facie case against them."

and has quashed the proceedings against the petitioners therein, who were parents-in-law of the de facto complainant therein.

7. Hence, in the light of the above said judgment and in view of the above held discussion, it is held that since there are no specific allegations of harassment against the petitioners, continuance of the proceedings against the petitioners would be abuse of process of law.



8. The Criminal Petition is allowed and the proceedings against the petitioners in FIR No.22 of 2025 on the file of the Kaghaznagar Town Police Station, Kumarambheem Asifabad District, are quashed.

SD/- P. PONNA KRISHNA
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Judicial First Class Magistrate, at Sirpur.
2. The Station House Officer, Police Station Kagaznagar, Kumarambheem Asifabad District.
3. Two CCs to the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana, Hyderabad.
4. One CC to Sri. Mohammad Naseer Pasha, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies



2025:TSHC:40531

HIGH COURT

DATED:23/10/2025

ORDER

CRLP.No.11455 of 2025



CRIMINAL PETITION IS ALLOWED

(8) MT
11/11/25