

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH**

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6951 of 2015

Between:

Dinesh Dattar

... Petitioner

and

The State of Telangana rep. by the Public Prosecutor and another

... Respondents

DATE OF JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED: 05-08-2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HONOURABLE Dr. JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgment? Yes/No
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? Yes/No
3. Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

HONOURABLE Dr. JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6951 of 2015

ORDER :

This petition is filed by the petitioner/A-6 under Section 482 Cr.P.C to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.1100 of 2011 on the file of X Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Secunderabad which is the outcome of private complaint filed under Section 200 Cr.P.C which was subsequently referred to Tukaramgate Police Station registered for the offences punishable under Sections 418, 420 and 120-B IP.C read with Section 82 of the Indian Registration Act.

2) Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the 1st respondent-State represented by the Public Prosecutor before admission, before ordering notice to the 2nd respondent and perused the material on record.

3) Needless to say the petitioner earlier unsuccessful in seeking to quash the cognizance taken by the learned Magistrate supra vide CrI.P.No.669 of 2015 and also in the common order against CrI.R.C. No.2478 of 2014 filed by defacto-complainant impugning the order of the learned Magistrate in not taking cognizance but for under Section 120-B and Section 83 of the Indian Registration Act so far as petitioner/A-6 concerned. There are no grounds even to admit the application to dispense with the appearance of the petitioner/accused throughout the trial for law will not permit but for to say he is entitled to the file a petition to consider

Special Vakalat to represent through Special Vakalat holder as the petitioner being the Sub-Registrar and to attend day to day office duties.

4) Having regard to the above, the petition is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioner to file an application under Section 205 Cr.P.C before the learned Magistrate and in such an event, the learned Magistrate after hearing, pass orders permitting him to represent through special vakalat holder for day to day hearing subject to such conditions of personal appearance as and when required like in Section 313 Cr.P.C examination.

5) With the above observations, the criminal petition is disposed of. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Dr. B. SIVA SANKARA RAO, J

Dt.5th August, 2015
KSH