

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

**THURSDAY ,THE NINTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO**

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE SHAMEEM AKTHER
AND
THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI**

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO: 1349 OF 2014

**Crl.Appeal Under Section 374 (2) of CrI.P.C. aggrieved by the Judgment
dated 05-11-2014 in S.C.No. 411 of 2013 on the file of the Court of the VIII
Additional District and Sessions Judge at Medak**

Between:

**Chakali Shekar @ Shekaiah, S/o. Pentaiah, R/o. Kowdipally Village and Mandal,
Medak District, (Now in Central Prison at Cherlapalli)**

...APPELLANT/ Accused

AND

State of Telangana, rept. by the Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.

...RESPONENT/ Complainant

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI. M. K. RATNAM

**Counsel for the Respondent: SRI C. PRATAP REDDY LEARNED PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR**

The Court delivered the following: Judgment

**THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE SHAMEEM AKTHER
AND
THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI**

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.1349 OF 2014

JUDGMENT: (Per Hon'ble Dr. Justice Shameem Akther)

This Criminal Appeal, under Section 374(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'Cr.P.C'), is filed by the appellant/accused, aggrieved by the judgment, dated 05.11.2014, passed in S.C.No.411 of 2013 by the VIII Additional Sessions Judge, at Medak, whereby, the Court below convicted the appellant/accused of the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay fine of Rs.5,000/-.

2. We have heard the submissions of Sri M.K.Ratnam, learned legal aid counsel for the appellant/accused, Sri C.Pratap Reddy, learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/State and perused the record.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is as follows:

The appellant/accused-Chakali Shekar @ Shekalah (hereinafter referred as 'accused') and the deceased-Bhagyamma (hereinafter referred as 'deceased'), are husband and wife and they were blessed with one son by name Ganesh, aged about 8 years.

and one daughter by name Nirisha (PW.2), aged about 6 years. The accused used to beat the deceased frequently. Panchayats were held in the presence of elders, wherein the accused was advised not to harass the deceased and lead marital life happily. The accused used to threaten the deceased that he would kill her at any time. On 13.02.2013 at 10:00AM, the accused and deceased along with PW.2 left their house and got down from auto at Velmakanne Village, Kowdipally Mandal and started proceeding to Pothireddipally Village on foot to attend a function. On the way, at the outskirts of Thummalapally Thanda, PW.2 complained that she was unable to walk and asked the accused to take her in his arms, for which the accused became angry and slapped PW.2. Then the deceased got angry and slapped the accused and questioned him as to why he beat PW.2. On that, the accused grew wild, beat the deceased with hands, dragged her to road side barren land, threw her on the ground, sat on her chest and beat with hands. Though PW.2 intervened, the accused pushed her away. Then, the accused picked up a boulder and beat the deceased on her head and face, due to which, the deceased received bleeding injuries and died on the spot. When PW.2 made hue and cry, the accused ran away from the crime scene.

/

4. Basing on Ex.P.1-report dated 13.02.2013 lodged by PW.1-Ch.Sangaiah, father of the deceased, PW.6-Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police, Kulcharam Police Station, registered a case in Crime No.10 of 2013 for the offence under Section 302 of IPC and issued Ex.P7-Express First Information Report. He recorded the statement of the PW.1-complainant and handed over the investigation to PW.7-Circle Inspector of Police. PW.7 visited the scene of offence, conducted scene of offence panchanama under Ex.P.5 in the presence of PW.5-Kurma Vittal, LW.8-Vajjala Narayana Reddy and seized MO.1-stone, M.O.2-bloodstained earth, M.O.3-controlled earth and thereafter, held inquest over the dead body of the deceased under Ex.P.6 in the presence of LW.8, PW.5 and LW.10-Chakali Lingamma and sent the dead body to Governemnt Area Hospital, Medak, for autopsy, got conducted autopsy by PW.4-Dr.Naveen Kumar, who issued Ex.P.4- PME report, seized bloodstained clothes of the deceased i.e, M.O.4-saree, M.O.5-petticoat and M.O.6-jacket and sent the material objects to Forensic Science Laboratory for examination and report. On 15.02.2013, PW.7 arrested the accused and interrogated him in the presence of LW.11-Arni Durgaiah and LW.12-Chintala Ravi during which, the accused confessed the commission of offence, recorded his confessional statement, and sent him to the Court for judicial

10

remand. On completion of investigation, PW.7 laid charge-sheet before the learned Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Medak, against the accused of the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC.

5. The learned Magistrate had taken cognizance against the accused of the offence under Section 302 of IPC, registered the same as P.R.C.No.19 of 2013 and committed the same to the Court of Session, since the offence under Section 302 of IPC is exclusively triable by the Court of Session. On committal, the Court below numbered the case as S.C.No.411 of 2013 and on appearance of the accused, framed charge against him of the offence under Section 302 of IPC, read over and explained to him, for which, the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. To prove the guilt of the accused, the prosecution examined PWs.1 to 7 and got marked Exs.P1 to P8, besides case properties, MOs.1 to 6.

7. PW.1-Ch.Sangaiah, is the complainant and father of the deceased. PW.2-Ch.Nirisha, is the daughter of deceased and the accused and an eye-witness to the commission of the offence. PW.3-Lambadi Keeli, is the eye-witness to the commission of the offence. PW.4-Dr.Naveen Kumar, is the doctor who conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased and issued Ex.P4-post-

mortem examination Report. PW.5-Kurma Vittal, is the panch witness for scene of offence and inquest. PW.6-Md. Ghouse, A.S.I of Police, who registered the subject crime and issued Ex.P7-Express FIR. PW.7-Sri K.Rama Krishna, Circle Inspector of Police, Medak Rural Circle, is the Investigating Officer, who conducted the investigation, arrested the accused and laid charge-sheet before the Court. Ex.P.1 is the report. Ex.P2 is relevant portion of 161 Cr.P.C. Statement of PW.2. Ex.P3 is bunch of four photographs. Ex.P4 is post-mortem examination report. Ex.P5 is scene of offence panchanama and rough sketch. Ex.P.6 is inquest report. Ex.P.7 is Express FIR. Ex.P.8 is FSL Report, dated 21.05.2013. MO.1 is the stone. MO.2 is bloodstained earth. MO.3 is controlled earth. MO.4 is the saree, MO.5 is the petticoat and MO.6 is the jacket of the deceased.

8. On completion of prosecution evidence, when the accused was examined under Section 313 of Cr.P.C., he denied the incriminating material appearing against him and pleaded that he was incapable of understanding the act committed by him. On behalf of the accused, no oral or documentary evidence was adduced.

9. The trial Court, having considered the submissions made and the evidence available on record, *vide* the impugned judgment, dated 05.11.2014, convicted the accused of the offence punishable

under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him as stated *supra*. Aggrieved by the same, the accused preferred this appeal.

10. The learned counsel for the appellant/accused would contend that there is no direct evidence to substantiate that the accused had caused the subject death of the deceased. There is no motive on the part of the appellant/accused to commit the subject offence. Even if the prosecution case is taken as true, there was grave and sudden provocation by the deceased and as such, the act of the accused would squarely fall within Exception 4 to Section 300 of IPC. Without there being any evidence on record, the trial Court came to an erroneous conclusion that the appellant/accused had caused the subject death and convicted and sentenced the accused of the offence under Section 302 of I.P.C. Further, PW.2-daughter of the accused did not support the prosecution case. PW.1-father of the deceased is not a direct witness to the alleged commission of offence. PW.3 is unreliable witness. There is no confession and recovery panchanama to prove that accused had caused the subject death. The prosecution failed to prove the guilt of the appellant/accused of the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC, beyond all reasonable doubt. Alternatively, it is vehemently contended that the appellant/accused is a person of unsound mind and not capable of understanding the acts committed by him.

Therefore, the appellant/accused is entitled for the benefit of Section 84 of IPC and ultimately prayed to allow the appeal by setting aside the conviction and sentence recorded against the accused and acquit him of the said offence.

11. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor would submit that there is direct evidence of PW.3-eye witness. The evidence of PW.3 is cogent and clear with regard to accused beating the deceased to death. The evidence of PW.2-daughter of the accused and the deceased, is partially reliable. Further, when there is direct evidence with regard to commission of an offence, motive loses its significance. The injuries were inflicted on the deceased with an intention to do away with her life, which resulted in her instantaneous death. There is medical evidence to substantiate the same. There is no inconsistency between the evidence of direct witnesses and medical evidence. There was no sudden provocation, as alleged. It is further contended that absolutely there is no evidence on record to substantiate that the accused was insane at the time of commission of the subject offence or has exhibited any signs of insanity, to grant benefit under Section 84 of IPC. The accused was leading normal life. After commission of the offence, the accused ran away from the scene of offence, which reflects that he was capable of understanding the act committed by him.

Therefore, the accused is not entitled for benefit of Section 84 of IPC. The Court below elaborately dealt with entire evidence on record and rightly arrived at a conclusion that the prosecution proved the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt of the offence under Section 302 of IPC and ultimately prayed to dismiss the appeal by confirming the conviction and sentence recorded against the accused *vide* the impugned judgment.

12. In view of the above submissions made by both sides, the points that arise for determination in this appeal are as follows:

1. *Whether the appellant/accused caused the death of the deceased-Bhagyamma on 13.02.2013?*
2. *Whether the appellant/accused was suffering from insanity at the time of commission of the subject offence?*
3. *Whether the prosecution was able to prove the guilt of the appellant/accused beyond all reasonable doubt?*
4. *Whether the conviction and sentence recorded against the appellant/accused of the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC, is liable to be set aside?"*

POINTS:

13. The case of the prosecution is that on 13.02.2013 at about 10:00AM, the accused and deceased along with PW.2 were proceeding to Pothireddipally Village on foot to attend a function and on the way, at the outskirts of Thummalapally Thanda, when

PW.2 complained that she was unable to walk and asked the accused to carry her, upon which, the accused became angry and slapped PW.2. Then the deceased got angry and slapped the accused and questioned, why he beat PW.2. On that, the accused grew wild and beat the deceased with hands, dragged her to road side barren land, threw her on the ground, sat on her chest and beat her with hands. Thereafter, the accused picked up MO.1-stone and beat the deceased on her head and face, as a result of which, the deceased received bleeding injuries and died on the spot, the accused is guilty of committing murder of the deceased.

14. There is no much dispute with regard to the nature of death of deceased i.e, homicidal. There is evidence of PW.4-Doctor, who conducted post-mortem examination over the dead body of the deceased. He deposed that on the requisition given by the Station House Officer, Kulcharam Police Station, on 13.02.2013, he conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased-Chakali Bhagyamma and found the following external injuries:

"1) Severe crush injury on the right side of the head.

2) Right eye was crushed."

He further deposed that on internal examination, he found big hematoma in the side of the brain and fracture of entire right skull. He opined that cause of death of the deceased was due to "head

injury". Ex.P.4-Post-mortem examination report issued by him substantiates the same. PW.4 further deposed that injuries found over the dead body of the deceased are possible by hitting with M.O.1-stone. In the cross-examination, PW.4 denied the suggestion that the injuries found over the dead body are possible by sudden fall on stones. There is also Ex.P.5-scene of offence panchanama and Ex.P.6-Inquest report. All these documents clinchingly establish that the death of the deceased is homicidal and it was caused on 13.02.2013 at the outskirts of Tummalapally Tanda, Hamlet of Pothireddipally village. The question that needs to be answered in this case is as to who caused the death of the deceased.

15. Ex.P.1 is the report dated 13.02.2013 lodged by PW.1-Chakali Sangaiah, father of the deceased. Admittedly, PW.1 is not a direct witness to the alleged offence. He deposed in his evidence that when he enquired with PW.2-Ch.Nirisha, daughter of the accused and the deceased, she informed that she cried to take and carry her, then the deceased asked the accused to take her and carry but the accused asked the deceased to take PW.2 and carry, then a quarrel took place between the accused and the deceased and the accused beat the deceased with a stone and killed her. When PW.2 was examined before the Court, she did not support the case of the

prosecution. She was hesitant to speak about her mother's death. She stated that she was present there, when her mother died. PW.2 further stated that while the deceased was running, hit a stone and fallen and died due to fall on the stone. This piece of evidence is inconsistent with the version of PW.4-Doctor, who deposed in his evidence that a person cannot get such crush injury by mere fall on stones.

16. There is evidence of PW.3-Lambodi Keeli, who stated that about one and half year prior to her deposition before the Court, she along with LW.6-Lambadi Kousalya, went to village to a flour mill and when they reached outskirts of Pothireddypally village, they heard cries of girl and rushed to the spot. She further stated that they noticed the accused beat a lady with a stone on head and pushed the girl aside and ran away. She identified the accused was the person who beat the lady and the lady died on the spot. Ex.P.3-bunch of four photographs and M.O.1-stone were marked through PW.3. She further stated that the photographs show the dead body and the stone with which the deceased was beaten. Though PW.3 was cross-examined at length, she reiterated what she stated in her chief-examination. In the cross-examination, PW.3 denied the suggestion that she did not see the accused beating the lady with stone and by the time she reached the place,

accused already left the scene. PW.3 had ample opportunity to see the accused. PW.3 is an independent witness. She neither has any grudge or animosity against the accused to depose against him nor any necessity to support the case of prosecution. The evidence of PW.3 is cogent and consistent. There are no omissions and commissions in her evidence. PW.4-Doctor, who conducted post-mortem examination over the dead body of the deceased and issued Ex.P.4-Post-mortem examination report, opined that the cause of death of the deceased was due to head injury. Thus the evidence of PW.3 can be safely relied upon.

17. PW.5-K.Vittal, deposed that police examined the scene of offence and prepared Ex.P.5-scene observation report and rough sketch and held inquest over the dead body of the deceased and prepared Ex.P.6-inquest report. He also deposed that police seized M.O.1 and clothes from the dead body and blood stained earth and controlled earth (M.Os.2 to 6). In the cross-examination of PW.5, he denied the suggestion that panchanama was not conducted by the police in his presence and also LW.8-Vajjala Narayana Reddy and that he signed on reports in the police station and that he was deposing falsehood at the instance of police.

18. PW.6-Md.Ghouse, Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police, Kulcharam Police Station, deposed about receipt of Ex.P.1-report

from PW.1 on 13.02.2013 at 1:00PM and registering the subject Crime No.10/2013 and issuing Ex.P.7-First Information Report and thereafter, recording the statement of PW.1 and handing over further investigation to PW.7-Circle Inspector of Police, Investigating Officer.

19. PW.7-K. Rama Krishna, Circle Inspector of Police, Medak Rural Circle, is the Investigating Officer, who deposed about conduct of Ex.P.5-scene observation report and rough sketch in the presence of PW.5 and another mediator and seizure of M.O.1-stone, M.O.2-bloodstained earth, M.O.3-controlled earth. Thereafter, he held inquest over the dead body of the deceased and prepared Ex.P.6-inquest report in the presence of panch witnesses and seized M.O.4-saree, MO.5-petticoat and M.O.6-jacket at the Hospital. PW.7 got photographed the scene of offence and dead body and examined PW.2, PW.3 and LW.3-Smt.Chakali Boodemma, LW.4-Chakali Srinivas, Lw.6-Smt. Lambadi Kousalya, LW.7-Chandapuram Sheka Goud and recorded their statements. PW.7 sent the material objects to Forensic Science Laboratory and obtained Ex.P.8-F.S.L report. PW.7 further deposed that he arrested the accused on 15.02.2013 and recorded his confessional statement in the presence of mediators and produced the accused before the Magistrate. On completion of investigation, PW.7 filed charge sheet. In the cross-

examination PW.7 stated that except M.O.1-stone, there was no other stone near the scene of offence. He denied the suggestion that the deceased died by falling on stone while running and that accused did not kill the deceased. The evidence of PW.3, PW.4-doctor and PW.7 falsifies the statement given by PW.2 that the deceased was hit by a stone while running and sustained injuries and died. There is direct evidence of PW.3 that the accused beat the deceased with stone and caused the subject death. Ex.P.8-F.S.L. Report also reveals that human blood was detected on the material objects seized i.e, M.O.1-stone, M.O.2-bloodstained earth, M.O.4-saree, M.O.5-petticoat and M.O.6-jacket of the deceased. Thus it can be safely concluded that the accused had beat the deceased on 13.02.2013 at 10:00AM, at the outskirts of Tummalapally Tanda, Hamlet of Pothireddipally village. Therefore, the contentions raised by the accused that there is no evidence to prove that the accused had caused fatal injuries to the deceased, are unsustainable.

20. The learned counsel for the appellant/accused would contend that even if the prosecution case is taken as true, there was grave and sudden provocation by the deceased and as such, the act of the accused would squarely fall within Exception 4 to Section 300 of IPC. Here, it is apt to state that for claiming an exception on the

ground of "grave and sudden provocation" the facts that are required to be proved are (1)that the accused received provocation; (2) that the provocation was (a) grave, and (b) sudden; (3) that he was deprived of his power of self-control by the provocation; (4)that he caused the death of the person who gave him the provocation. Further, the question whether the provocation was grave and sudden enough amounting to commission of murder is a question of fact, but should not be treated as a question of law and should be decided basing on the facts and circumstances of each case. In the instant case, as per the evidence of PW.2, the accused and the deceased quarreled on a petty issue, i.e., with regard to carrying PW.2. PW.2 wanted to carry her as her legs were paining, for which, the accused refused and beat her, whereupon the deceased abused/slapped the accused. It is not a case of grave and sudden provocation. For merely abusing/slapping the accused, there was no necessity for the accused to beat the deceased, who is his own wife, with a stone like MO-1 on vital part of her body, i.e., head and cause bleeding injuries, resulting in her instantaneous death. The accused acted in a cruel and unusual manner. There is no evidence on record to arrive at a conclusion that there was grave and sudden provocation by the deceased to the accused, due to which, the accused lost his self-control, incapable of understanding his acts before cooling down, caused the subject death of the

deceased. In the given facts and circumstances of the case, it can be safely concluded that the assault on the deceased by the accused is premeditated and not in a fit of anger. It was well within the knowledge of the accused that the injury being caused by him to the deceased will result in her death. Under these circumstances, the contention that the act of the accused would squarely fall within Exception 4 to Section 300 of IPC, is unacceptable. The trial Court has also elaborately dealt with this aspect and gave reasons for discarding the submission of the accused that the case falls under Exception 4 to Section 300 of the IPC. The manner in which, the deceased was hit with a stone on vital parts i.e, face and head and caused instantaneous death of the deceased, demonstrates that the injuries were caused in order to do away with the life of the deceased. Therefore, the instant case does not fall within the exceptions given under Section 300 of IPC. It is a clear case of murder.

21. Learned counsel for the appellant/accused alternatively contended that the accused was insane at the time of commission of the subject offence and therefore, the accused is entitled to the benefit of Section 84 of IPC. As seen from the evidence on record, the accused and deceased along with PW.2 left their house to attend a function. They travelled by auto for some distance.

Thereafter, they wanted to cover the rest of the distance by foot. On the way, at the outskirts of Thummalapally Thanda, Hamlet of Pothireddipally village, dispute arose in between the accused and the deceased with regard to carrying of PW.2 and in that process, the subject death of the deceased had taken place. The circumstances establish that the accused was quite normal and he was not suffering from any mental ailment at that point of time. It is also appropriate to extract the provision under Section 84 IPC, which reads as follows:

84. Act of a person of unsound mind - *Nothing is an offence which is done by a person, who, at the time of doing it, by reason of unsoundness of mind, is incapable of knowing the nature of the act, or that he is doing what is either wrong or contrary to law.*

22. The standard to be applied in a case where a plea of insanity is taken is whether, according to the ordinary standard adopted by a reasonable man, the act was right or wrong. An accused who seeks exoneration from liability of an act under Section 84 of IPC has to prove 'legal insanity' and not 'medical insanity'. The expression "unsoundness of mind" has not been defined in the IPC. But the term 'insanity' carries different meaning in different contexts and describes varying degrees of mental disorder. Every person who is suffering from mental disease is not *ipso facto* exempted from criminal liability. The burden to prove insanity is on the accused. Even if the accused establishes unsoundness of mind,

Section 84 of IPC would not come to his rescue, in case it is found that the accused knew that what he was doing was wrong or that it was contrary to law. In order to ascertain the same, it is imperative to take into consideration the circumstances and the behavior preceding, attending and following the crime. In a recent judgment in **Mohd. Anwar vs. The State (N.C.T. of Delhi)**¹, the Hon'ble Apex Court held as follows:

"16. The plea of mental disorder too remains unsubstantiated. No deposition was made by any witness, nor did the appellant himself claim any such impairment during his Section 313 CrPC statement. On the contrary, his conduct of running away from the spot of the crime on 17.05.2001 as well as the attempt to escape from the bus on 20.05.2001 evidence an elevated level of mental intellect. The answers recorded in response to the questions put forth by the Additional Sessions Judge at the Sec 313 CrPC stage are also not mechanical or laconic. For example, the appellant explains his refusal to participate in the TIP proceedings by alleging that his face had already been shown by the police to the complainant.

17. Mere production of photocopy of an OPD card and statement of mother on affidavit have little, if any, evidentiary value. In order to successfully claim defence of mental unsoundness under Section 84 of IPC, the accused must show by preponderance of probabilities that he/she suffered from a serious-enough mental disease or infirmity which would affect the individual's ability to distinguish right from wrong. Further, it must be established that the accused was afflicted by such disability particularly at the time of the crime and that but for such impairment, the crime would not have been committed. The reasons given by the High Court for disbelieving these defences are thus well reasoned and unimpeachable."

¹ (2020) 7 SCC 391

In the instant case, there is no evidence to show that the accused was of unsound mind at any point of time. It is relevant to state that subsequent conduct of the accused in the course of trial has no relevance to arrive at a conclusion that the accused suffered from mental unsoundness and was incapable of understanding the act committed by him. Further, the accused taking treatment prior to the commission of the offence or subsequent to the commission of the offence has no relevance to hold that the subject death was caused in a state of unsound mind. Furthermore, the evidence of PWs.2 and 3 demonstrate that the accused beat the deceased with MO.1 stick on her head and ran away from the scene. When PW.1 reached the scene of offence, the accused was not there. There is clear evidence of PW.3 that the accused beat the lady with a stone on head and pushed the girl and ran away. On this issue, the Court below held that had the accused was in unsound state of mind and not capable of knowing what he was doing, he would not have ran away from that place on arrival of PW.3 and another person and that the material fact that the accused ran away soon after killing his wife (deceased) reflects that the accused was capable of understanding his act and the consequences that flow from such act. So he ran away from the scene of offence in order to save himself and avoid punishment. It demonstrates that the accused was in a fit state of mind and capable of understanding his acts.

✓

We concur with the findings recorded by the Court below. Further, when the prosecution has established its case, it is incumbent upon the accused, under Section 105 of Indian Evidence Act, to establish the case of his private defence, though not beyond all reasonable doubt, but on the preponderance of probabilities. The accused failed to discharge his onus by producing any evidence, much less cogent and convincing evidence. In view of the same, we are of the considered opinion that the alternative plea that the accused was insane at the time of commission of the subject offence and therefore, the accused is entitled for benefit of Section 84 of IPC, is unsustainable. No self-defence is available to the accused.

23. The Court below had meticulously dealt with the entire evidence on record and rightly found the accused guilty of the offence under Section 302 of IPC. There is nothing to take a different view. In view of these circumstances, none of the grounds raised on behalf of the appellant/accused merit consideration. The appeal is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed.

24. Accordingly, the Criminal Appeal is dismissed, confirming the conviction and sentence recorded against the appellant/accused of the offence under Section 302 of IPC *vide* judgment dated 05.11.2014, passed in S.C.No.411 of 2013 by the VIII Additional Sessions Judge, at Medak.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this appeal, shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-K.SRINIVASA RAO
JOINT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The VIII Additional District and Sessions Judge at Medak *(with Records)*
2. The Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Medak.
3. The Station House Officer, Kulcharam Police Station, Medak
4. One CC to SRI. M. K. RATNAM, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana (OUT)
6. Two CD Copies
7. One Spare Copy



HIGH COURT

DATED:09/06/2022



JUDGMENT

CRL.A.No.1349 of 2014

DISMISSING THE CRL.APPEAL.

ATM (9)
13/9/2022