

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4085 OF 2025

9th DAY OF DECEMBER 2025

Between :

Cheruku Saritha & three others

... Petitioners/A.1 to A.4

And

The State of Telangana,
Through its Public Prosecutor,
High Court Building,
High Court, Hyderabad & another

... Respondents

ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to quash the proceedings against the petitioners who are accused Nos.1 to 4 in C.C.No.1734 of 2023 on the file of Principal Junior Civil Judge-cum-VIII Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally. The

offences alleged against the petitioners are under Sections 341, 323, 506, 427 r/w.34 of Indian Penal Code.

2. The facts of the case are that 29.04.2023 the defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that the petitioner No.1 herein is his wife. On 23.04.2023 at around 1:30 PM, when respondent No.2 was at his friend's house Dr. Jagadeesh, Flat No. 404, VGP Braun Apartments, Gokul Plots, the petitioners herein arrived and verbally abused him in filthy language and physically assaulted him. Fearing for his life, he escaped and drove towards the police station in his car bearing No.TS 06 ES 3611, but the accused followed him, pelted stones at his vehicle, and caused damage to the windshield, windows, and mirrors. At Allwyn Junction, they intercepted his car on bikes, continued the attack, and demanded to open the car door. Under duress, when he opened the car door, his wife and one Sai Ram entered the car, using force in an attempt to take him to LB Nagar to coerce him into signing documents to transfer his property. He managed to reach the police station and reported the incident orally, but when he tried to file a written complaint, the accused threatened him again, warning him of dire consequences if he proceeded. Out of fear for his life, he refrained from taking further action. The threats continued over phone calls to him

and his relatives. On 24.03.2023 one Narsimha, who is the maternal uncle of his wife called respondent No.2 and abused in filthy language, and threatened to kill him. The respondent No.2 had recently filed petition for divorce on the ground of cruelty, and upon knowing this, the accused allegedly resorted to criminal intimidation to force him into meeting their unlawful demands. The respondent No.2 claimed that he was under constant threat to his life from the accused. As such, requested the police to take necessary action against the accused persons. Basing on the said complaint case was registered against the accused.

3. Heard Sri E.Vishwa Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent No.1-State and Sri Nageshwar Rao Pujari, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2-defacto complainant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners are innocent of the allegations made against them. It is submitted that the marriage between petitioner No.1 and the respondent No.2 was solemnized on 15.11.2017. At the time of marriage, petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 allegedly gave 75 tulas of gold,

Rs.30 lakhs in cash, and Rs.15 lakhs towards purchase of a car to respondent No.2, in addition to incurring Rs.30 lakhs towards marriage expenses. At that time, respondent No.2 was only a medical graduate, and subsequently, petitioner No.2 spent approximately Rs.15 lakhs for his postgraduate studies. He further contended that after completing post-graduation, respondent No.2 joined SLG Hospital, Bachupally. From 2020–2021, respondent No.2 frequently traveled to Dubai for official work, accompanied by a woman named Prathyusha and during this period, he developed an extramarital relationship with her and began harassing petitioner No. 1. Respondent No.2 is said to be cohabiting with Prathyusha at VP Braun Apartments, Gokul Flats, KPHB, having rented a flat under the pretext of being husband and wife, and has since neglected petitioner No. 1. Further petitioner No. 1 caught respondent No.2 and Prathyusha red-handed at the said flat, following which they fled the scene by car. Thereafter, respondent No.2 allegedly filed a false case against the petitioners to shield his illegal activities. He also contended that respondent No.2 and Prathyusha resigned from their respective jobs, relocated, and changed their address. When these facts were brought to the attention of respondent No.2 parents, they allegedly supported him and

encouraged his actions against petitioner No. 1. Furthermore, respondent No.2 is said to have filed a false complaint against petitioner No.1 and her father, as well as a divorce petition, with the intent to pressurize her into consenting to a divorce. It is also alleged that the police are supporting respondent No.2. Hence, continuation of proceedings against the petitioners is nothing but abuse of process of law and prayed to quash the proceedings initiated against the petitioners.

5. On the other hand learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant would submit that all the petitioners with an intention to kill respondent No.2 attacked him and also abused him in filthy language. Police already investigated the case and filed charge sheet. Therefore it requires trial and there are no grounds to quash the proceedings against the petitioners and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Upon considering the submissions made by both parties and the material available on record, the learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the respondent No.2 was found to be residing with another woman and on knowing the same, the petitioners visited the said premises, where respondent No.2 and the woman allegedly fled away from the scene, colliding

petitioner No.1 in the process. Petitioner No.1 subsequently lodged a report with the police; however, no case was registered based on her complaint. Further it is admitted that the relationship between petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 is strained. The statement of Dr.Jagadeesh, a friend of respondent No.2 shows that all the petitioners approached respondent No.2, abused him in filthy language, and attempted to stop his vehicle while he was driving. When he refused to get down from the car, the petitioners allegedly broke the car's glass with their hands, resulting in bleeding injuries to them. The police arrived at the scene and took all the parties to the police station. However, his statement contradicts with that of statement of respondent No.2. According to respondent No.2 the petitioners threatened him not to lodge a complaint against them. It is also noted that petitioner No.1 also filed a complaint with the police. The disputes appear to have arisen from the strained marital relationship between petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2. In view of the nature of the allegations, the contradictory statements of the witnesses, and the background of the dispute, this Court finds it appropriate to quash the proceedings initiated against the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed quashing the proceedings against the petitioners/A.1 to A.4 in C.C.No.1734 of 2023 on the file of Principal Junior Civil Judge-cum-VIII Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 09.12.2025
Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4085 OF 2025

Date: 09.12.2025

Rds