IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12722 of 2025

18.03.2026

Between:

Konatham Dhilip Kumar @ Konatham Dileep Reddy.

PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep by Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of
Telangana, at Hyderabad,
And another.

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed seeking the Court to quash the proceedings initiated against the petitioner who is arrayed as accused No.2 in FIR.No.87 of 2025 before the Nakrekal Police Station.

2. The brief facts of the case are that basing on a complaint lodged by the 2nd respondent, the prosecution case is that the 2nd respondent, a Congress party leader belonging to the BC community, alleged that certain YouTube channels and T-News telecasted false news linking him with one Nalla Srinu @ Bandi Srinu, who was arrested in connection with the SSC Telugu Board exam paper leakage case, portraying Srinu as his driver. According to the complainant, such telecast and subsequent circulation on social media damaged his reputation, insulted him on account of his community, and adversely affected his political career. Acting on the said report, the police registered the above FIR against the petitioner, for the offences punishable under Sections 353(1)(c), 353(2) of BNS and Section 3(1)(u) of the SC/ST (POA) Act.

3. Heard Sri TV. Ramana, learned counsel for petitioners, and Sri Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for respondent – State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated due to

political rivalry and to divert public attention from the SSC paper leakage case. He contended that the allegations in the complaint do not disclose any offence under Section 353 BNS, as there is no mens rea attributable to the petitioner. Further, no rumour or alarming news was circulated by him so as to attract Section 353(2) BNS, which requires intent to promote enmity or hatred between communities. He argued that the ingredients of Section 3(1)(u) of the SC/ST (POA) Act are also conspicuously absent, since the alleged news item does not refer to caste and no words were uttered against the complainant on account of his community. He further submitted that mere forwarding of news items on social media does not ipso facto constitute a criminal act, and the alleged fake news was not generated by the petitioner himself. He emphasized that multiple FIRs have been registered for the same incident, which is impermissible in law, and this Court has already quashed FIR No.87 of 2025 against another accused by order dated 09-09-2025 in Crl.P. No.8989 of 2025. Therefore, continuation of proceedings against the petitioner amounts to abuse of process of law, and the FIR is liable to be quashed.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for respondent No.1 –State, opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for petitioner, and contended that complaint clearly discloses that the accused persons, with an intention to damage the complainant's reputation and political career, forwarded fake news on social media. He further contended that during investigation, witnesses were examined and incriminating material including social media posts was collected. Therefore, the FIR cannot be quashed at the threshold, as the matter is under investigation and sufficient material exists to proceed against the petitioner.

6. Having regard to rival submissions made, and on going through the material placed on record, it is evident that the allegations in FIR No.87 of 2025 arise out of the incident of alleged false news circulation in connection with the SSC paper leakage case. The complainant's grievance is that her reputation and political career were damaged by social media posts linking her with one of the accused. However, even assuming for a moment that the petitioners had circulated or forwarded such content, the essential ingredients of the offences as alleged, are not attracted.

7. At this stage, it is imperative to note that this Court has already considered an identical issue in Crl.P. Nos.8965, 8966 and 8989 of 2025 by common order dated 09.09.2025, wherein it was categorically held that the alleged Twitter post relating to the SSC paper leakage case does not disclose any intention to incite enmity between communities, nor does it creates fear or alarm to the public so as to disturb public tranquility. It was further held that registration of multiple FIRs on the basis of one and the same incident amounts to abuse of process of law, relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **T.T. Antony v. State of Kerala**[1] and this Court in **Jakka Vinod Kumar Reddy v. State of Telangana**[2].

8. That being so, it is held that applying the same reasoning to the present case, the allegations in FIR No.87 of 2025 are squarely covered by the earlier order of this Court. Therefore, continuation of proceedings against the petitioner would amount to an abuse of process of law.

---

[1] (AIR 2001 SC 2637)
[2] (AIRONLINE 2021 TEL 76)

9. Hence, this Criminal Petition is allowed and the proceedings initiated against the petitioners in FIR.No.87 of 2025 before the Nakrekal Police Station, are hereby quashed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall also stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date : 18.03.2026
PT

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12722 of 2025

Date : 18.03.2026
PT