

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

SATURDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J SREENIVAS RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 4717 OF 2016

Between:

1. D.CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY, S/o. Raja Reddy, Aged 50 years, Occ Agriculture, H.No. 11-5-152/2, Officers Cooperative Society, Red Hills, Nampally, Hyderabad - 500 004
2. A. Ravinder, S/o A. Kishtaiah, Aged 56-years, Occ Agriculture, R/o Plot No. 491, II Floor, Vasanth Nagar, Kukatpally, Ranga Reddy District.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF TELANGANA, REP., PP, High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad
2. P.Venkatarami Reddy, S/o.Late P.L.N. Reddy, Aged 65 years, R/o.Flat No.602, H No1-10-11/1, Gokul Apartments, Street No.4, Ashok Nagar, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANTS

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 quash the proceedings in C.C.No.811/2014 on the file of XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad, at Kukatpally, R. R. District and to pass

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2019

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 extend the interim stay dated 04/04/2016 as granted vide CrI.P.No. 4717 of 2016 and pass such other order or orders as this Honourable Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2022

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 permit the petitioners/petitioners to take out notice against the 2nd respondent/respondent herein by causing paper publication in any local daily newspaper of Hyderabad and pass

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2016(CRLPMP. NO: 5379 OF 2016)

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 grant stay of all further proceedings including the appearance of the petitioners in C.C.No.811/2014 on the file of XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad, at Kukatpally, R.R.District in the interest of justice and pass

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2019

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 extend the stay granted by this Honourable Court on 04-04-2016 in Crl.P.No. 4717 of 2016.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri BHAVANI SANKAR N ,Advocate for the Petitioner and Sri. M. Vivekanda Reddy the Asst. Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1. and of Sri P. Prabhakar Reddy Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J. SREENIVAS RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 4717 of 2016

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, (for short, 'the Cr.P.C.') by the petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 2 seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.811 of 2014 on the file of the XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Kukatpally, Ranga Reddy District, for the offence under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, 'the IPC').

2. Brief facts of the case:

Respondent No.2 filed a private complaint before the IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Kukatpally, on 17.12.2009 stating that the petitioners have forged and fabricated documents including the revenue records i.e., Form 13-C, Form 13-B, proceedings No.B/2657/1990 dated 15.08.1990 and Pattadar passbooks by causing wrongful loss to him and members of M/s. Bhagyanagar Cooperative Housing Society Limited, and filed suit in O.S.No.1457 of 2009 for grant of perpetual injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with the suit schedule property. After receiving the summons in the above said suit, respondent No.2 came to know that the petitioners have

created and fabricated the documents and claiming rights over the properties. When respondent No.2 approached the Mandal Revenue Officer seeking details of the pattadar passbooks and RoR proceedings, the Mandal Revenue Officer, after conducting enquiry informed him that the pattadar passbooks were not issued by the officials of the Mandal Revenue Officer, Balanagar Mandal and also issued Memo dated 17.09.2009, wherein it is stated that Form No.13-B, Form No.13-C in File No.RORB/2693/1990 are not available in the office i.e., Mandal Revenue Office, Balanagar Mandal. Basing on the said private complaint, learned Magistrate had referred the matter to the Madhapur Police Station under Section 156(3) of the Cr.P.C. for investigation, accordingly, the police registered the Crime No.734 of 2009 for the offences under Sections 420, 468 and 471 of the IPC and the Investigating officer after conducting investigation filed a charge sheet for the offence under Section 420 of the IPC and deleted the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC. Learned Magistrate took the cognizance and issued summons. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners filed the present criminal petition seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.811 of 2014.

3. Heard Mr. T. Pradyumna Kumar Reddy, learned Senior Counsel, representing Mr. N. Bhavani Shankar, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. P. Prabhakar Reddy, learned counsel for respondent No.2, and Mr. M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent No.1 State.

4. Submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners:

4.1. Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the petitioners have not committed the offence and they falsely implicated in the crime. The petitioners are the lawful owners and they have purchased the property through sada sale deed dated 12.05.1983 by paying valuable sale consideration and they are bonafide purchasers. The revenue authorities after following the mandatory procedure prescribed under the provisions of Telangana Rights in Land and Pattadar Passbooks Act, 1973 (for short, 'the RoR Act') issued regularization proceedings and their names were mutated in the revenue records and pattadar passbooks were also issued in their favour.

4.2. He further submitted that even according to the allegations made in the complaint or in the charge sheet, the ingredients of Section 420 of the IPC do not attract.

The Mandal Revenue Officer, Balanagar Mandal, filed affidavit before the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, wherein he specifically stated that RoR proceedings and mutation proceedings in Rev.No.D5/7371/2010 issued in favour of the petitioners are genuine. The Investigating Officer after conducting thorough investigation rightly deleted the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC, on the other hand filed a charge sheet for the offence under Section 420 of the IPC, though the ingredients for the said offence do not attract.

4.3. He also submitted that the nature of the allegations made in the complaint are purely civil in nature and to dissolve the civil disputes, respondent No.2 filed the complaint and the same is not permitted under law, especially the petitioners filed a suit in O.S.No.1457 of 2009 and the same is pending before the competent civil Court.

4.4. Learned Senior Counsel vehemently contended that once the Investigating Officer came to the conclusion that the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC have not established against the petitioners, the offence under Section 420 of the IPC do not attract against the

petitioners. Hence, the continuation of the proceedings for the offence under Section 420 of the IPC against the petitioners is clear abuse of the process of law.

4.5. In support of his submission, he relied upon the following judgments:

1. **Ashok Kumar Jain v. State of Gujarath¹;**
2. **Mala Choudhary and another v. State of Telangana and another²;**
3. **Delhi Race Club (1940) Ltd. and others v. State of Uttar Pradesh and another³; and**
4. **Jit Vinayak Arolkar v. State of Goa and others⁴.**

5. Submissions of learned counsel for respondent No.2

5.1. *Per contra*, learned counsel submitted that the petitioners are claiming rights over the property situated at Kaitalapur Village, Kukatpally, Balanagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, covered by Sy.No.1007, basing upon the un-registered sale deed dated 12.05.1983, which is a sham document, and the alleged validation of proceedings issued by the revenue authorities are forged and fabricated

¹ 2025 SCC OnLine 998

² 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1474

³ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2248

⁴ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 31

documents. He further submitted that as on the date of the alleged document, dated 12.05.1983, Mandal System was not established and the Mandal System came into existence in the year 1985 only. The petitioners, from inception with a dishonest intention to claim the rights over the property created forged and fabricated documents including revenue proceedings, filed suit in O.S.No.1457 of 2009 before the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar, for grant of perpetual injunction. After receiving the summons in the suit only, respondent No.2 and members of the Bhagyanagar Cooperative Housing Society Limited came to know that the petitioners are claiming rights over the property based upon a forged and fabricated documents.

5.2. He further submitted that the Madhapur Police, during the investigation of Crime No.734 of 2009, sought details of Pattadar Passbooks and ROR records pertaining to Survey No. 1007 of Kaitalapur Village. In response to that the Deputy Collector and Tahsildar, Balanagar Mandal, through Letter No.B/482/2010 dated 23.01.2010, informed that Pattadar Passbooks No. 354181 and 354182 and Title Deeds No. 362698 and 362699 corresponding to

Patta Nos. 162 and 163 were not issued to the petitioners. Further, there were no entries, proceedings, or Forms 13-B and 13-C in File No.B/ROR/2693/1990 in the names of the petitioners. The Tahsildar confirmed that Pattadar Passbooks and Title Deeds were not issued in favour of the petitioners from the office of Mandal Revenue Office, Balangar, and do not exist in the official revenue records. However, the Investigating Officer solely based on the affidavit filed by Mr. Jayaraj, who is a retired Mandal Revenue Officer, before the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, in REV.No.D5/7371/2010 dated 03.03.2012, deleted the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC, even without verifying the proceedings issued by the Mandal Revenue Office, Balanagar, and Deputy Tahasildar, Balanagar, filed a charge sheet for the offence under Section 420 of the IPC.

5.3. He further submitted that the petitioners filed suit for perpetual injunction and along with the said suit filed temporary injunction application and the said application was dismissed by the learned Principal Senior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy, and the said order was confirmed in

C.M.A.No.45 of 2013 on 09.03.2017 and the above said orders have become final.

5.4. Learned counsel further submitted that merely because of deletion of the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC by the Investigating Officer, while filing the final report, the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings for the offence under Section 420 of the IPC. There are specific allegations levelled against the petitioners that from inception they are claiming the subject property with a dishonest intention in the absence of any rights, interest over the property.

5.5. Learned counsel further submitted that the complainant/informant/prosecution would not be precluded from seeking a remedy if the Investigating Authorities have failed in their duty by not including into the final report/charge sheet all Sections of the IPC, on which the offence can be held to have been made out in spite of the facts disclosed in the F.I.R. He also submitted that the learned Magistrate cannot add or subtract Sections at the time of taking cognizance based on a police report. However, the learned Magistrate is having power to add the offences and the same would be permissible at the time of

framing of the charges under Sections 216, 218 or 228 of the Cr.P.C and that stage has not been reached in the present case.

5.6. He further submitted that there are specific allegations levelled against the petitioners that they forged and created the documents and claimed rights over the property. The Investigating Officer merely based upon the affidavit filed by the retired Tahasildar, deleted the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC, respondent No.2 is entitled to put-forth his grievance about applicability of above said offences against the petitioners at the time of framing of charges. Hence, the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings, based upon the grounds which are pleaded in the present criminal petition. Whether the petitioners have committed the offences with a dishonest intention from the date of inception or not, is a disputed question of fact and the same has to be revealed after full-fledged trial only and the petitioners are not entitled to seek quashing of the proceedings at this stage basing upon the disputed facts.

5.7. In support of his contention, learned counsel relied upon the following judgments:

1. **State of Gujarat v. Girish Radhakrishnan Varde⁵**
and

2. **Gayatri Prasad Prajapati v. State of U.P. and another⁶.**

6. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor reiterated the submissions made by learned counsel for respondent No.2.

Analysis:

7. Having considered the rival submissions made by the respective parties and after perusal of the material available on record, it reveals that the petitioners are claiming rights over the property to an extent of Ac.26.00 gts., and Ac.10.00 gts. covered by Sy.No.1007 of Kaitalapur Village, Kukatpally, Ranga Reddy District, basing upon the unregistered sale deed dated 12.05.1983. According to the petitioners, the said sada sale deed was validated by the revenue authorities exercising the powers conferred under RoR Act and their names were mutated in the revenue records and pattadar passbooks were issued. Whereas, the claim of respondent No.2, who is a Secretary of Bhagyanagar Co-operative Housing Society Limited, is that Bhagyanagar Co-operative Housing Society Limited had purchased the land admeasuring Ac.167.00 gts. in Sy.1007

⁵ (2014) 3 SCC 659

⁶ 2022 Supreme (All) 1501

situated at Kukatpally Village, Balanagar, Ranga Reddy District, through registered sale deeds vide document No.8985 of 1991, 8824 of 1994, 2547 of 1996 and 1621 of 2021 and the said Society developed the subject land into residential plots and obtained layout from GHMC and the said Society has allotted the residential plots to its members and executed registered sale deeds in their favour and also the said Society purchased the land admeasuring Ac.70.00 gts. in part of Sy.No.1007 through registered sale deed bearing document No.2548 of 1886 and land admeasuring Ac.22.00 gts.. The petitioners, without having any manner of right in respect of the suit schedule property of Bhagyanagar Co-operative Housing Society Limited and its members, based upon the forged and fabricated documents, claiming the rights to an extent Ac.36.00 gts. in Sy.No.1007 and filed a suit in O.S.No.1457 of 2009 on the file of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Kukatpally, for grant of perpetual injunction. After receiving summons in the said suit, respondent No.2 and members of Bhagyanagar Co-operative Housing Society Limited came to know that the petitioners based upon fabricated and forged documents filed suit and claiming rights over the property.

8. The specific case of respondent No.2 is that the documents which are relied upon by the petitioners are forged and fabricated one and that the revenue authorities, after due verification, informed that the records pertaining to the RoR proceedings, mutation proceedings and pattadar passbooks, which were claimed by the petitioners, are not available in the Mandal Revenue Office. The record further discloses that the Deputy Collector and Tahasildar, Balanagar Mandal in his letter No.B/482/2010 dated 23.01.2010, had informed that the pattadar passbooks and title deed and 1-B proceedings are not issued in favour of the petitioners or to any other person in respect of Survey No.1007 or with its sub- divisions.

9. The record further reveals that one B. Jayaraj, who is a retired Mandal Revenue Officer, filed an affidavit before the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, in REV.No.D5/7371/2010 dated 03.03.2012, stating that the mutation proceedings have been issued on 30.11.1990 in the name of the petitioners in respect of the subject property. Basing on the said affidavit, the Investigating Officer deleted the offences under Sections 468 and 471 of the IPC and filed a charge sheet for the offence under

Section 420 of the IPC. The record further reveals that the said retired officer was not shown as a witness and he was examined by the Investigating officer and his statement was also not recorded under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C.

10. In **Ashok Kumar Jain** *supra*, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that in order to attract Sections 415 and 420 of the IPC there must be a fraudulent or dishonest inducement by the accused, causing the person cheated to deliver property or act/omit something to their detriment, and the accused must have had a dishonest intention at the time of inducement. As held in **Prof. R.K. Vijayasathy v. Sudha Seetharam**⁷, the essential elements of cheating include both dishonesty and resultant harm or risk of harm to the victim, while **AM Mohan v. State**⁸ emphasizes that for Section 420 IPC, the FIR must clearly show the inducement, deception, and dishonest intention.

11. In **Delhi Race Club (1940) Ltd** *supra*, the Hon'ble Supreme court has stated that the complaint does not disclose the essential ingredients of cheating or criminal breach of trust. An allegation of criminal breach of trust

⁷ (2019) 16 SCC 739

⁸ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 339

under Section 405 IPC cannot automatically support a charge of cheating under Section 415 IPC, as both offences require distinct elements and mens rea. Not every act of breach of trust constitutes a criminal offence; while a civil wrong may exist giving rise to a civil remedy, criminal liability arises only when there is evidence of fraudulent or dishonest misappropriation. Cheating, in particular, requires dishonest intention from the very inception of the transaction. In contrast, criminal breach of trust occurs when a person lawfully receives movable property but subsequently retains or converts it dishonestly. Whether an act amounts to criminal breach of trust or only civil liability depends on the specific facts and the intention of the party in each case.

12. In **JIT Vinayak Arolkar** *supra*, the Hon'ble Supreme court held that the purchasers under the sale deeds have not made any grievance about the deeds. As held in *Mohd. Ibrahim v. State of Bihar*⁹, a complaint of cheating under Section 415 IPC requires that the complainant be deceived by fraudulent or dishonest inducement, causing delivery of property or harm. Execution of a sale deed in favour of another person, without deception or misrepresentation to

⁹ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 31

the complainant, does not constitute cheating. A third party who is not the purchaser cannot allege that the vendor's act caused harm to them. In the present case, the appellant has neither executed the sale deeds on behalf of the 4th respondent nor purported to transfer the 4th respondent's rights; there is no allegation that the appellant deceived the 4th respondent or caused damage in body, mind, reputation, or property.

13. In **Mala Choudhary** *supra*, the Hon'ble supreme court held that the complainant to cloak a civil dispute in the garb of a criminal offence. The FIR alleges that the accused appellants agreed to sell plot No. 82 and a farm house for Rs. 5,00,00,000/- and further purportedly promised to procure an adjoining plot through personal influence. However, the civil suit filed by the complainant later alleges a total consideration of Rs. 5,75,00,000/- based on Rs. 1,15,000/- per square yard, and makes no reference to any promise regarding the neighbouring plot, revealing a clear distortion of facts. The registration of the FIR has, therefore, been manipulated to misuse the criminal machinery, resulting in the arrest and custodial humiliation of appellant No. 1, a 70-year-old lady. From

even the admitted allegations, no cognizable offence is disclosed, and the complainant should have been directed to seek remedy in a civil court. During the hearing, the appellants offered to return the funds transferred through valid banking channels, which the complainant refused. In the circumstances, this is a fit case for imposing exemplary costs on the complainant for misusing the process of criminal law to pursue a matter of purely civil nature.

14. On careful consideration, this Court finds that the judgments relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, is clearly distinguishable on facts and does not come to their aid. In the decisions cited, the Hon'ble Apex Court found no fraudulent inducement or dishonest intention at the inception of the transaction. In the present case, there are specific allegations against the petitioners that they created fabricated documents with a dishonest intention to claim over the property, though they are not having any manner of right over the subject property and basing on the said fabricated documents, filed civil suit in O.S. No.1457 of 2009 and secured ad-interim injunction, which was later vacated and confirmed in C.M.A. No.45 of 2013 on 09.03.2017. The said allegations *prima facie*

discloses deception and dishonest intention from the very inception, thereby attracting the ingredients of Sections 415 and 420 IPC or not. Whether the petitioners have in fact deceived respondent No.2 or committed the offence under Section 420 IPC or not, that can only be determined in a full-fledged trial. The contentions raised by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners relate to disputed questions of fact, which cannot be adjudicated in the present criminal petition.

15. In **Girish Radhakrishnan Varde** *supra*, the Hon'ble apex court held that section 190(1) CrPC provides three ways in which a Magistrate may take cognizance of an offence: (a) on a complaint, (b) on a police report, or (c) on information or suspicion from any other person. When cognizance is taken on a complaint, the Magistrate may conduct an enquiry under Sections 190/200/202 CrPC and decide whether the offence is made out, adding or deleting sections as appropriate. In contrast, when a case arises from a police report/FIR under Section 154 CrPC, the investigation is conducted by police under Chapter XII CrPC, and the charge-sheet submitted to the Magistrate. In such FIR-based cases, the Magistrate does not have

authority to add or remove sections at the pre-cognizance stage; the correctness of sections and framing of charge is determined only by the trial court at the stage of framing of charges under Sections 211, 216, 218 or Section 228 Cr.P.C. The Court emphasized that conflating the procedures for complaint cases and FIR-based cases is incorrect and contrary to the CrPC. Accordingly, in a police report-based case, the prosecution may seek addition of sections at the framing of charge stage, while the accused may object to particular charges. The trial court must consider these pleas based on the FIR and material collected during investigation. The Court clarified that this procedural distinction preserves the proper exercise of judicial discretion and ensures fairness in criminal proceedings.

16. In **Gayatri Prasad Prajapati** *supra*, the Allahabad High court has stated that the stage of framing of charge, the trial court is not restricted by the order of cognizance. While cognizance involves forming a prima facie opinion about the commission of an offence based on available material, the court is not required to examine the evidence in depth, nor is the accused heard at this stage.

Subsequent charge-sheets may include additional evidence, such as forensic reports or witness statements, which were not part of the original charge-sheet. The trial court must consider the entire material on record at the framing of charge stage to determine whether it raises a strong suspicion against the accused for commission of other offences not initially cognized. The accused is always afforded an opportunity at the framing of charge to seek discharge or challenge particular charges. Therefore, if on considering the complete material, the trial court finds that offences not initially cognized, such as Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 203 IPC, are prima facie made out, framing of charges for such offences is legally permissible and does not constitute an error of law or jurisdiction.

17. After due consideration, this Court finds that the judgments relied upon by the learned counsel for respondent No.2 are applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case. In the case on hand, the police filed final report against the petitioners for the offence under Section 420 of the IPC with specific accusations. As held in the cited decisions, in cases arising from a police report, the trial court is empowered to

consider addition or deletion of offences at the stage of framing of charges and that stage has not yet reached.

18. It is already stated supra, the petitioners have filed simple suit for perpetual injunction before the learned Principal Senior Civil Judge, Kukatpally, and temporary injunction was dismissed by the said Court. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have filed C.M.A.No.45 of 2013 and the said appeal was also dismissed and it is trite law that mere pendency of civil cases is not a ground to seek quashing of the criminal proceedings, both are different and distinctive.

19. It is very much relevant to mention that in **Sau. Kamala Shivaji Pokarnekar v. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.**¹⁰, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has to be exercised in exceptional cases sparingly, with caution, only to prevent abuse of process or to secure the ends of justice; and it cannot be invoked to weigh evidence or stifle a genuine prosecution, but may be applied where the allegations in the complaint, taken at face value, do not disclose the basic ingredients of any offence. The case on hand is not the

¹⁰ (2019) 14 SCC 350

rarest of rare cases to exercise powers of this Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.811 of 2014.

20. For the foregoing reasons, this Court does not find any ground to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.811 of 2014 the file of the XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Kukatpally, Ranga Reddy District.

21. Accordingly, the criminal petition is dismissed. However, taking into consideration the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the presence of the petitioners in C.C.No.811 of 2014 is dispensed with, unless their presence is specifically required subject to the condition that the petitioners shall represent through their counsel on each and every date of hearing. In case of non-appearance of the petitioners on the specific date so fixed by the trial Court for their appearance, the trial Court is entitled to proceed with the matter, in accordance with law. It is needless to observe that any of the observations made in this order are only for the purpose of deciding this case and the trial Court shall decide the matter basing upon the evidence, which is going to be adduced by either of the

parties, in accordance with law.

Miscellaneous applications, pending if any, shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/- MOMINA MEHAR
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER

One Fair Copy to the Honourable Sri Justice J.Sreenivas Rao
(For his Lordships kind perusal)

To,

1. The XXV Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad at Kukatpally, Ranga Reddy District.
2. The IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Kukatpally at Miyapur, Cyberabad.
3. The SHO Madhapur Police Station, Cyberabad, Telangana.
4. 11 L.R.Copies.
5. The Under Secretary, Union of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi.
6. The Secretary, Telangana Advocates Association Library, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.
7. One CC to SRI BHAVANI SANKAR N., Advocate [OPUC]
8. Two CCs to the Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad (OUT)
9. Two CD Copies

168

HIGH COURT

DATED:25/10/2025



ORDER

CRLP.No.4717 of 2016

DISMISSING THE CRLP.

23 copies
18
4/11/25