

NOTE : The Petitioner/ Accused was directed to be released on bail by the order of the High Court dated 09.11.2000, in CrI.R.C.M.P.No. 3037 of 2010, in CrI.R.C No.2067 of 2010.

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

**TUESDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.SURENDER

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 2067 OF 2010

Criminal Revision Case under Section 397 R/W 401 Cr.P.C against the Judgment dated 25.10.2010 made in CrI.Appeal No. 69 of 2009 on the file of the Court of the VI Additional Sessions Judge, Mahabubnagar preferred against the Judgment dated 13.05.2009, in S.C. No. 382 of 2007, on the file of the Court of the Assistant Sessions Judge at Mahabubnagar.

Between:

Syed Faheem, S/o. Syed Sadiq, Occ: Auto Driver, R/o. D.No. 7-112/3, near New Mosque, Abbusher Colony, Pahadi Shareef, Hyderabad, N/o. Rauf Sab Darga, Yerrammugutta, Veerannapet of Mahabubnagar District.

...REVISION PETITIONER/APPELLANT NO. 2/ACCUSED No. 2

AND

The State of A.P., Represented by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of A.P., at Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI. M. ACHUTA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent : PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K.SURENDER
CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.2067 of 2010

ORDER:

1. The revision petitioner was initially prosecuted for the offence under Section 395 IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period five years vide judgment in S.C.No.382 of 2007 dated 13.05.2009 by the Assistant Sessions Judge, Mahabubnagar. In appeal, learned Sessions Judge found that the prosecution failed to prove that the revision petitioner was part of the group which committed dacoity. However, found that in view of the material objects being recovered from the revision petitioner, conviction was altered to Section 411 of IPC and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years vide common judgment dated 25.10.2010 in Criminal Appeal Nos.68,69 and 70 of 2009 passed by VI Additional Sessions Judge at Mahabubngar.

2. Learned counsel appearing revision petitioner would submit that the revision petitioner was falsely implicated, however, he was aged only 20 years when the incident has taken place. There are no

other cases insofar as the revision petitioner is concerned. Since there are dependents, who are wife, children and parents of the revision petitioner, learned counsel prayed to reduce the sentence of imprisonment.

3. Keeping in view that the revision petitioner was found not guilty of the offence of dacoity and there are no other cases pending against him of similar kind. Further, keeping in view that the incident is of the year 2007, nearly 17 years have passed by, this Court deems it appropriate to reduce the sentence of imprisonment to the one already undergone by the revision petitioner.

4. Accordingly, the revision case is partly allowed.

Sd/- K. SAILESHI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The VI Additional Sessions Judge, Mahabubnagar. (With records if any)
2. The Assistant Sessions Judge at Mahabubnagar.
3. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. (OUT)
4. One CC to SRI. M ACHUTA REDDY Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies

DL/gh

HIGH COURT

DATED:27/08/2024

ORDER

CRLRC.No.2067 of 2010



PARTLY ALLOWING THE CRIMINAL REVISION CASE.

PA
28/10/24
8 Copies.