

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.450 OF 2026

DATE : 24.06.2026

Between :

B.Sai Krishna
S/o. B.Babaiah.

...Petitioner/
Respondent

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep.by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State,
Hyderabad.

... Respondent
Respondent

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the docket order, dated, 03.07.2025, in CrI.A.No.177 of 2019 on the file of learned III Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar.

2. The docket order, dated 03.07.2025 reads as follows:

“Accused No.1/appellant (B.Sai Krishna) is called absent and there is no representation. He obtained suspension of sentence but failed to turn up. He is not attending the Court from long time. Lower Court record is received and P.W.1/complainant was

present before the Court on last date. Waited till 4:30 PM. No representation. This appeal is dismissed for default thereby conviction against accused for the offence under Section 498-A IPC against accused is confirmed. Accused is sentenced to Simple Imprisonment for one year, it is deemed confirmed. Learned trial Court magistrate is directed to issue conviction warrant and see that it is executed against accused.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that as the petitioner was not appeared before the learned trial Court on the date fixed by it, it was erroneously dismissed the appeal for default and the conviction imposed against the petitioner was confirmed; that as the petitioner was not present pursuant to the said dismissal order, the petitioner was arrested on 17.04.2026 and remanded to judicial custody and since then he has been in judicial custody and hence, he requested the Court to set aside the impugned docket order directing the learned appellate Court to dispose of the Criminal Appeal, after hearing the parties.

4. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the same and submits that after considering the facts and circumstances, the learned

appellate Court passed the impugned order and there are no grounds to interfere with the same.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and considering docket order passed by the learned appellate Court, the criminal revision case is filed against dismissed for default is not in accordance with law. Since the petitioner was not appeared before the Court on that particular date, the learned appellate Court in view of violation of conditions imposed by the Court while suspending the sentence can issue NBW but cannot dismiss the appeal for default. The appeal has to be disposed of on merits. Hence, the impugned order is liable to set aside.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is allowed setting aside the docket order, dated 03.07.2025, in Crl.A.No.177 of 2019 passed by the learned III Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District, L.B.Nagar and the learned District Judge is directed to dispose of the said appeal expeditiously. Further, the petitioner shall be released on bail on executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of learned III

Additional Metropolitan Magistrate at L.B.Nagar, Ranga
Reddy District.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand
closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 23.06.2026

YVL