HONOURABLE Dr. JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6390 of 2013

ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed by the petitioners/ accused Nos.1, 4 and 5, under Section 482 Cr.P.C to quash the proceedings in C.C. No.190 of 2013 on the file of XIII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Nampally, Hyderabad where the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC and Sections 4 & 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 in Crime No.274 of 2012 of WPS, CCS, Hyderabad, which is outcome of report of 2nd respondent—de facto complainant, was registered on 06.06.2012 against 5 accused of whom, accused No.2, who is no other than brother of accused No.1 and accused No.3, no other than wife of brother of accused No.1, both are residents of USA even shown in the Crime, were deleted from the array of the accused in the police final report.

2) Heard learned counsel for the petitioners/ accused Nos.1, 4 & 5 as well as 1st respondent—State represented by learned Public Prosecutor and also the learned counsel for 2nd respondent—de facto complainant. Perused the material on record.

3) The charge sheet is filed only against the

accused Nos.1, 4 and 5 (who are the petitioners herein) that was taken cognizance by the learned Magistrate for the offences punishable under Section 498-A, 406 IPC and Sections 4 & 6 of D.P Act. As per the charge sheet nine witnesses were examined during investigation including the defacto complainant—LW.1, who is the father-in-law of 1st accused and father of the alleged victim—LW.2, LW.3—mother of victim and wife of defacto complainant and the other five witnesses are Kakarla Balaji, K.Sathyanarayana, I.Subba Raidu, Dr.K.Shiva Rama Krishna and M.V.Ramana Reddy, all are residents of Hyderabad.

4) The sum and substance of the accusation in the report of the defacto complainant and from police final report against the accused persons was that: (a) the defacto complainant (LW1) got two daughters Swetha (LW.2) and Keerthi, of whom eldest daughter Swetha's marriage was performed with accused No.1—Kakarla Hareesh on 23.05.2003 at Noma function hall, Nacharam, Hyderabad and immediately, after marriage she joined her matrimonial home and started living at her in laws; that she did engineering ECE; accused No.1 is also an engineer working in USA. Though prior to the marriage, accused Nos.4 and 5 (who are parents of accused No.1) stated that they are not interested in any dowry but after fixing of the marriage, accused Nos.1 to 5 demanded to pay dowry of Rs.25,00,000/- in cash, 1kg gold ornaments,

2 kgs silver articles and another Rs.2,00,000/- cash towards clothes of the relatives of accused No.1; 5 tulas gold jewellery + clothes + Rs.20,000/- cash to Suresh Kakarla and his wife Mrs.Lavanya Nadella as minimum customary dowry items and defacto complainant with great difficulty accepted for the same and performed the marriage and even after LW.2—Swetha joined the marital house, she was subjected to humiliation by belittling for not paying dowry to their expectations.

(b) After marriage, on 23.05.2003, the accused No.1 left USA on 14.06.2003 and thereafter he tried to choose to apply VISA through drop box instead of personal appearance before consulate and the accused Nos.1 to 4 were stating that their demands are not yet fulfilled and there was no urgency for the same. The U.S.A Visa was granted on 19.06.2003 to her and after fulfilling the demands made by accused Nos.1 to 5, she was sent to USA on 05.09.2003 to join the accused No.1 —husband in Phoenix, Arizona State; that at the time of sending her to USA, parents of accused No.1 (accused Nos.4 & 5) retained the entire dowry amounts and valuables apart from additional jewellery of her about 30 tulas gold, with them stating that they will send all the jewellery to U.S in the future and for safe custody. In USA, Accused No.1 and LW.2—Swetha were staying in a rented double bed room apartment and within two days of their living together therein, accused Nos.2 and 3 also shifted to that apartment and started living with them. Thereafter, they were regularly belittling and harassing LW.2—Swetha saying that she is misfit to accused No.1 and their family and started demanding to pay Rs.15 lakhs towards additional dowry and when she reported the same to her parents, the de facto complainant complied with the same by paying the amount in October and December, 2003.

c) Swetha joined M.S in Computer Engineering in January, 2004 and completed in May, 2005 and even though accused No.1 accepted for continuation of her education, accused Nos.2 to 5 developed grudge against her. Gradually, accused Nos.2 and 3 brought their children also to USA, so also their parents. The accused No.1 and his wife—Swetha were visiting them once in a month and also during long holidays, there, Swetha was subjected to harassment by them. After completion of M.S in June, 2005, Swetha along with accused No.1 came to India and stayed more than for one month. During this time, a plot owned by accused No.1—Mr.Hareesh Kakarla at Dandamoodi Enclave, Medchal Road, accused No.1 with no worth value, he and his parents insisted and compelled Swetha to purchase the same by paying consideration and with lot of difficulty, the defacto complainant sold the plot in the year 2010 for Rs.30,000/- more than what he paid to accused No.1. In July, 2003, the defacto complainant and accused No.4—

father of accused No.1 purchased a plot admeasuring 1062.71 Sq.yds at Venkateshwara Nagar, A.S.Rao Nagar, Hyderabad for a sale consideration of Rs.54.00 lakhs and registered in the name of Ms.Karunamayi Kakarla, out of which the defacto complainant paid Rs.22,60,000/- towards his half share. In November, 2003, accused No.1 and accused Nos.2 and 3, who are in USA in active consent, knowledge and connivance with his parents—accused Nos.4 & 5 in India increased the tone and tenor of harassment towards Swetha. Later, they entered into a development agreement to develop the plot admeasuring 1062.71 Sq.yds, which they purchased in the ratio 60: 40 to say 40% of share to the owner of the land i.e., accused No.5—Karunamayi is about Rs.1,31,00,000/- out of which, the defacto complainant entitled to half a share, however, under the threat of harassment and life threat to Swetha, accused No.4 and 5 with the active connivance of accused No.1 completely misappropriated the same. Taking advantage of his position as one of the cheque signatories, accused No.4 retained three cheques issued by the firm for Rs.25,00,000/- in favour of wife of defacto complainant towards part of her share in the venture of the cheques drawn on Andhra Bank, A.S Rao Nagar Branch. Accused No.4 induced the wife of defacto complainant to sign on the reverse of the three cheques and withdrew the entire amounts in cash and misappropriated the same. In the month of January, 2007, accused Nos.1, 4 and 5 compelled Swetha to transfer plot admeasuring 333 Sq.yds of Kanch Gachi Bowli, Nallagandla Village, Sherilingampally Mandal towards additional dowry by getting a registered sale deed executed in favour of accused No.4 and it was falsely shown in the sale deed, as if sale consideration was paid to the defacto complainant but in fact no amount was paid. From January to March, 2007 due to keeping the defacto complainant and his family members under threat of further harassment to Swetha and as per demands of accused No.4 and his family members, defacto complainant paid Rs.4,25,000/- by way of cheques in favour of accused Nos.4 & 5. In April/ May, 2007 even though he was not having enough funds with him, accused No.1 and his parents started harassing Swetha and demanding him to pay Rs.35,00,000/- for purchase of land, due to threat of increased harassment and danger to life of Swetha and as per the demands made by accused Nos.1 to 5, he was compelled to raise amount by taking loans and paid Rs.35,00,000/- to M/s.A.V.C Housing Private Limited on 05.05.2007 on behalf of accused No.4 towards part of sale consideration for land admeasuring about 1 acre at Rachalur Revenue Village, Kandukuru Mandal by accused No.4. Thereafter, he stated that he was not having any more capacity to pay any further amounts and pleaded accused No.4 not to harass his daughter and him. Further, after going to USA, his daughter got job in Wells Fargo Bank where she worked from March, 2006 to June, 2007 and earned net salary of Rs.70,000/- and this entire amount was taken away forcefully and misappropriated by accused Nos.1 and 2.

d) Accused Nos.2 and 3 owned M/s.Sure IT Solutions, in which Swetha worked as HR Manager for ten months from September, 2008 to July, 2009 and entire salary for this period was however misappropriated by accused Nos.1 to 3, except for a sum around US$ 6,000/- paid for about three months out of the period. Swetha was suffering from gynecology problem from March, 2007 in spite of which, she was left to herself to take treatment without any help from family members and she had come to India and take treatment by staying at the house of the defacto complainant for one month i.e., October/November, 2007 and in that period, Swetha visited her in-laws, where she was abused and belittled by entire family and upon which she returned back to the parents house. The harassment at home in USA also not going down. The defacto complainant consoled his daughter to keep up hoping for good. In February, 2008, Swetha got operated for plantar warts on which she was advised to take three weeks complete bed rest. However, immediately after going home, accused No.1 started harassing her for sitting at home idle and he completely restricted her from contacting her parents and he was in exclusive possession of all her bank cards, passport and money and cut off giving any amounts to her even for groceries. He on the other hand used to go and spend time at his brother's house leaving Swetha in a total destitute state. Accused Nos.2 and 3 by visiting the house of accused No.1 and used to demand Swetha that they rent their house and come and stay with them to take care of their children and cook for them as if a maid servant. On 22.06.2008, accused No.1 called defacto complainant at midnight time in USA from the office of his brother—accused No.2, putting her father also on teleconference stating that his daughter has been talking to him and her friends over phone in spite of being told by him not to do so and that she has become useless to him due to not generating any kind of revenue to him and that defacto complainant and his daughter will face dire consequences, if his daughter does not generate further revenue for him. The accused persons used to harass Swetha regularly and attributing that she is useless and cannot bear any children and it is better to leave her. At the first delivery of Swetha, accused No.1 and his parents —accused Nos.4 & 5 refused to permit Swetha to come to her parents house and for the defacto complainant's wife went to USA to look after and help Swetha in her advanced days of pregnancy, the accused were annoyed and accused No.1 abused Swetha and her mother for her coming to USA without taking permission from him and his family members and Swetha and her mother bore all the troubles and looking at their attitude, they got frightened and on their request the defacto went to USA on 05.08.2009 and admitted her in hospital on 08.08.2009.

e) On 09.08.2009 Swetha gave birth to a male child. After 10 days, accused No.1 started abusing defacto complainant and his wife alleging not following the required ceremonial rituals even defacto complainant brought 5 tulas of gold ornaments to the child by accused No.1's saying such a small gift not sufficient to their status and after 21st day ceremony, defacto complainant came back to India on 04.10.2009, accused No.1 was harassing Swetha and also her mother. On 21.09.2009 he created a big scene in the house by hurling a table lamp at Swetha and also abused mother of Swetha and accused No.1 ultimately left the house on 19.10.2009 stating that he is not going to return unless mother of Swetha returns to India and started living with his brother and while leaving the house on 19.10.2009, he took away the passports of Swetha and the newly born child with him.

f) Accused No.1 was not even respond to phones calls of Swetha, she sent an e-mail to accused No.1 narrating some of the things that he has done and thereafter, accused No.1 sent his friends and well wishers of Swetha and suggested that if she does not take back the e-mail, she would be divorced through US Court and out of fear, she sent another e-mail on 30.10.2009 withdrawing earlier e-mail and after which, accused No.1 came to home on 31.10.2009 and from then onwards he started demanding Swetha and her mother to fall at the feet of his parents and ask for their mercy for returning to India on 25.12.2009 and after that accused No.1 stopped bringing edible groceries to the house or providing any money to meet the household expenses and in February, 2010, accused No.1 sent Swetha to bring groceries from the stores, after picking up the items and when she tried to make payment through credit card, it did not work due to which she has to put all the items back on the stand again and return home. When she was saying the incident, accused No.1 laughed at her and said that he discontinued the credit card in September, 2009 itself and sent her to the stores to make her know in what situation she is. On the other hand he used to go and spend time at his brother's house leaving Swetha in a destitute state and not even providing money for bringing groceries. Accused No.1 also kept the certificates and documents of Swetha with him and accused No.1 filed divorce petition in US Court stating that the marriage has become irreconcilable in spite of continuing to stay in the same house with Swetha.

g) Thereafter, Swetha does not have funds at her disposal even to move around or appoint a good lawyer on her own to defend much less for transportation. Apart from this, she was entirely made responsible to look after the kid all by herself without help of any one and without any basic needs provided by accused No.1 and in that situation, accused No.1 served notice in the case on Swetha along with an injunction order restraining her from leaving the city. In such a situation, Swetha was compelled to seek legal advice from an advocate, who was not aware of the Indian laws and she contested the case, she was not even given child visitation rights, and under such compelling and coercive circumstances, Swetha had no choice to sign whatever pleadings prepared by her counsel and ultimately the Court in U.S. granted decree of divorce, which is not as per Hindu law and not with her free will or consent and same is void under law. During the proceedings, it came to light that accused No.1 even after being married and having a wife, assigned all his LIC policies to his father accused No.4, who with his son's knowledge pledged the policies and misappropriated them. While things stood thus, accused No.1 by visiting the common places which Swetha visits and abused her with foul and humiliating language and threatened her.

h) Accused No.1 and all his family members made the life of Swetha miserable to end her life and she was prevented by constant counseling from defacto complainant and his wife and friends. Swetha was subjected to cruelty, dowry harassment and domestic violence and forceful confinement besides physical and emotional blackmailing by accused No.1 and his family members individually and collectively. Swetha was returned to India with broken heart in a helpless state.

5) Basing on the above allegations, the learned Magistrate taken cognizance for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 406 I.P.C and Sections 4 and 6 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners filed the present petition contending that the marriage took place on 23.05.2003, 1st petitioner left to U.S.A on 14.06.2003 and the daughter of the 2nd respondent joined the 1st petitioner on 05.09.2003, that except the monetary transactions as averred by the 2nd respondent, no harassment has taken place at Hyderabad, that even in the entire complaint there are no specific allegations against petitioners 2 and 3/A-4 & A-5, that even if all the allegations in the report dated 06.06.2012 so belatedly besides barred by limitation, are even taken in its face value, the offences alleged against the petitioners under Sections 498-A, 406 I.P.C or Sections 4 and 6 of the Dowry Prohibition Act are not made out and even the alleged harassment has taken place outside India and outside the jurisdiction of the Court and thus the charge sheet laid and the proceedings initiated by the 2nd respondent are nothing but a pure

abuse of process of law and it has to be interdicted at the threshold, the learned Magistrate should not have taken cognizance and therefrom prayed to quash the entire proceedings against the petitioners.

6) So far as allegations against the accused Nos.1, 4 and 5 concerned, leave about the allegation of prior to marriage though stated no dowry required after marriage fixed asked for and given Rs.25,00,00/- apart from 1kg gold ornaments, 2 kgs silver articles and another cash of Rs.2,00,000/- towards clothes to the relatives of accused No.1 by accused Nos.4 and 5; the Visa applied for Swetha was through drop box by A-1 instead of his personal appearance before consulate. In this regard undisputedly A-1 left U.S only on 14.06.2003 i.e., about 20 days after the marriage. The Visa was from the very report and police final report granted on 19.06.2003 itself to say hardly within 2 or 3 days of A-1 reached U.S he obtained Visa for his wife-Swetha. Thus, the allegation is with no basis. From the very report and police final report, Swetha reached U.S.A to join the company of A-1 on 05.09.2003. It is not even stated the delay in her going after Visa cleared and granted on 19.06.2003 till 05.09.2003 for nearly 2 ½ months was on the part of any of the accused persons. So far as alleged giving of the amount or gold ornaments or jewelry and retention by A-4 and A-5 concerned, there could be no basis shown

muchless about possessing of means and where purchased the gold and with what type of ornaments and when entrusted to A-4 and A-5 the in-laws of Swetha and by whom. There is nothing to say but for a stray sentence that after marriage and Swetha joined the company of her husband before he left U.S.A on 14.06.2003, she was subjected to humiliation by belittling in not paying dowry to their expectation, it was not specific about any of the incidents and when taken place for not even a case for any additional dowry in that period. Thus, practically during short stay of Swetha and A-1 in the house of A-4 and A-5 after marriage on 23.05.2003 till A-1 left U.S.A on 14.06.2003, there is nothing particularly against A-1, leave about any further stay of Swetha in the in-laws that is of A-4 and A-5 till she left U.S.A on 05.09.2003 joined the company of her husband A-1 at Arizona State. The further allegations are in relation to Swetha and A-1, the couple took a rented premises, where A-2 and A-3 also started living or their belittling her or demanding any additional amount or harassing or her reporting to her father the defacto-complainant and his meeting of Rs.15,00,000/- during October and December, 2003, there is nothing so far as against A-4 and A-5 in this regard but for if at all against A-1 leave about the crime against A-2 and A-3 ultimately after investigation their names deleted by not charged in the final report from investigation. Said incident is not only outside the jurisdiction of the Court but also outside India, if at all against A-1 leave about no case against A-2 and A-3 from the police final report that was taken cognizance. Even coming to subsequent allegations of Swetha pursued her further studies in abroad and once in a month or on holidays Swetha and A-1 were visiting A-2 and A-3 in Arizona and she was subjected to harassment that also only against A-2 and A-3 against whom there is no police final report charging leave apart anything against A-1 that only in the abroad. So also in relation to Swetha employed in the so called entity of A-2 and A-3 for about 10 months or she was not paid anything or A-1 to A-3 appropriated the salaries due to her but for $6,000 paid out of that period that is also the occurrence abroad and nothing within India that too only against A-2 and A-3 if at all. So far as the ill-health of Swetha there while staying with her husband or not attending by A-1 including in her Gynic problem that was also in America and coming to the subsequent allegation of she came down to India and while staying at her parents' house undergone the treatment in October and November, 2007. It is to say that in that period when she visited her in-laws she was abused or belittled that was also as vague as anything with no basis.

7) Even coming to the subsequent averment of in February, 2008 Swetha was operated and was advised complete bed rest while they were staying at Arizona

State and A-1 her husband harassed her by sitting idle by restricted her moments including by preventing to contact over phone with her parents or detained her credit card or passport or cut of giving of money to her even for groceries or made to purchase groceries by allowing to use a credit card which was cut of without funds that could not retrieve to pay and return of the groceries at the shop that was narrated also at abroad and nothing in India that too against A-1.

8) Even coming to Swetha gave birth to a child, it was abroad and the allegation is A-1 did not even permit Swetha to come to her parents in India or abused when mother of Swetha went to look after the care of Swetha during her advanced pregnancy by A-1's abuse of Swetha and her mother even that is also in U.S.A including about Swetha and her mother out of fear requested the defacto-complainant and he went there by 05.08.2009 and admitted her in hospital on 08.08.2009 and Swetha gave birth to a male child in U.S.A on 09.08.2009 and any abuse by A-1 for not performing ceremonial rituals for the child after birth at U.S.A during their stay including in saying what the ornaments they brought to give to the child as a pittance including the so called A-1's irrespective of having left the company of his wife Swetha and her mother on 19.10.2009 during their stay in U.S.A, even for her phone calls which made her to

sent an e-mail or A-1 sent his friends or friends of Swetha to take back the e-mail with a threat to give divorce otherwise and she sent another mail on 30.10.2009 withdrawing the earlier mail and there from only A-1 came back to the home on 31.10.2009 also taken place in U.S.A including the alleged subsequent harassment by A-1 to tender apology by Swetha and her mother to his parents for their mercy or A-1 not bringing even groceries to the house and not providing money etc.,

9) Thus, when those are all taken place in U.S.A and nothing in India and there is no even compliance of the requirement of Section 188 Cr.P.C even to submit that Swetha is not an Indian citizen there is no material before the Court including from the police final report material for the learned Magistrate to ignore or to say non-application of Section 188 cr.P.C that too for there is no previous sanction of the Central Government as required if at all the section applies for the alleged acts of the offences committed outside India by a citizen of India. No doubt, it is shown A-1 is not a citizen of India as he acquired citizenship in America and thereby the rigor of Section 188 Cr.P.C is not applicable is the submission of the learned counsel for the defacto-complainant in the course of hearing the quash petition. However, that no way suffice to overlook application of Section 177 and 178 Cr.P.C that too from what is discussed supra and in so far as A-1 leave about A-2 and A-3 for nothing charging them from

the final report concerned of any part of the offence committed within the local area of the jurisdiction of the Court. From this background even coming to A-1 transferred after marriage, the L.I.C policies taken by him in favour of his father and he pledged and received the proceeds concerned there is no offence there from to say committed against the defacto-complainant or his daughter, wife of A-1 Swetha.

10) From the above, at the cost of repetition, there is no any entrustment of any property or dominion over property that could made out to attract the offence under Section 406 I.P.C muchless even against A-4 and A-5 for what is discussed supra for nothing to say who entrusted when entrusted and what property and on what date and what proof to say entrusted and in the absence of which any bald or stray sentence no way suffice to attract the offence punishable under Section 406 I.P.C. There remains from the above accusations, the so called partnership in Everest Constructions standing in the name of mother of Swetha to undertake as partner mother-in-law of Swetha and the parents-in-law of Swetha with the active connivance of her husband A-1 allegedly obtained blank cheques under threat of harassment and life threat to Swetha or A-4 allegedly retained three cheques issued by the firm in the name of mother of Swetha for Rs.25.00 lakhs allegedly withdrawn and misappropriated by A-4

concerned, it is unknown, how a cheque in the name of the bearer issued by a drawer, without signature of the bearer by transfer or with endorsement on the reverse as signature on the reverse also of received the contents as an authorization to encash and if at all there is no truth little for such a huge amount could any prudent person keep quite without recourse that too from the year 2006-2007 till the little finger raised in the police report dated 06.06.2012 to give any little credence and even the alleged offence not shown barred by limitation. The delay in setting the law in motion also a ground to quash the proceedings against sustainability apart from highly unbelievable of the said story against A-4 and A-5. Coming to the transfer of the flat measuring 333 Sq. yards of Kanchi Gachibowli by the execution of sale deed in favour of A-4 showing the sale consideration is paid that was allegedly taken place in January, 2007 when the same if an outright sale and the contents of the document even from the report averments and police final report version after investigation show a sale transactions and what has given as the transfer is to meet the additional dowry, difficult to believe after lapse of several years to same, more than 5½ years in representing with reference to it as if executed as a sale deed though it is to meet the additional dowry.

11) Even coming to the entering of development agreement of the plot of 1062.71 Square yards that

stands in the name of A-5 mother-in-law of Swetha by giving 40% share and for development with 60% share to say defacto-complainant is entitled to half share or same was allegedly misappropriated by A-4 and A-5 with connivance of A-1 with reference to the so called cheques retained by A-4 of those issued in favour of mother of Swetha, to say A-4 induced mother of Swetha to sign on reverse side of three cheques to withdraw, it is highly unbelievable for defacto-complainant himself is a man well versed with his affairs could leave nothing for A-1 to take a cheque by obtaining signature from his wife by A-7 to encash that too for such a huge amount as also referred supra in this regard. Thus, there is no case that could be made out so far as A-4 and A-5 concerned for the learned Magistrate to take cognizance against them for any of the offences.

12) It is also important to mention that prima facie once there is a presumption in relation to the judicial and official proceedings under Section 114 of the Indian Evidence Act clause (e) no doubt to be read with Section 13 and 14 of C.P.C to say not even conclusive from clause (c) of Section 13 C.P.C of parties covered by Hindu Marriage Act and the same not applied therein till such showing the presumption under Section 14 C.P.C, the Court has to draw unless rebutted the presumption by showing the contrary, leave about the submission of the

parties to the jurisdiction of the foreign Court whether left open, still to raise for an exparte proceeding and even otherwise, the remedy is to impugn or to maintain a separate proceeding for matrimonial relief in India by saying that foreign judgment is not binding and relation of man and wife still subsists despite that foreign Court decree of divorce by showing within the purview of Section 13 C.P.C if not also within its purview read with Section 44 of the Indian Evidence Act of any fraudulent obtaining which is not even her case of fraudulent obtaining for she engaged advocate of her choice but for saying not properly defended her cause if any by the advocate and she could not pursue actively because of personal inconveniences. Thus, only remedy is to show within the purview of Section 13 C.P.C in showing not conclusive under Section 14 C.P.C. Even from the expression in ***Sanapareddy Maheedhar Seshagiri V. State of Andhra Pradesh***[1] where no doubt also held on the scope of Section 188 Cr.P.C of the bar is for enquiry/trial and not for taking cognizance in saying even during trial such a sanction of the Central Government can be obtained.

13) Further, coming to the domestic violence case, when it is categorically stated there is no domestic violence in the proceeding in answering one of the specific queries it is difficult to presume the alleged acts of

cruelty there even against A-1 leave about A-4 and A-5. Having regard to the above, the proceedings are liable to be quashed.

14) In the result, the petition is allowed and the proceedings in C.C. No.190 of 2013 on the file of XIII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad at Nampally are hereby quashed. The bail bonds of the accused, if any, shall stand cancelled. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

DR.JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO

Dt.01.04.2016
ksh

---

[1] 2006 Lawpad (AP) 1208