IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J SREENIVAS RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 6548 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

Abdul Raheem, S/o. Abdul Azeez, Age. 63 years, Occ. Business, R/o H.No. 5-7/2, Athargally, Balkonda Mandal, Nizamabad District, Telangana State.

...Petitioner/Accused

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by the Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana.
2. Mujuge Srinivas, S/o Narayana, Age. 50 years, Occ. Dy. Tahsildar (CS), R/o. Jemmanjetty Gally, Armoor Town, Nizamabad District, Telangana State

...Respondents

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings against the Petitioner/Accused in CC No. 499 of 2021 on the file of the Principal Judicial First-Class Magistrate at Armoor.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings against the petitioner/Accused in CC No. 499 of 2021 on the file of the Principal Judicial First-Class Magistrate at Armoor pending disposal of the main criminal petition.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Alluri Divakar Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner and Sri Jithender Rao Veeramalla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and none appeared for the Respondent No.2.

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J.SREENIVAS RAO
CRIMINAL PETITION No.6548 of 2026
Date: 28.04.2026.

Between:

Abdul Raheem

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana and another

...Respondents

ORDER

This Criminal Petition has been filed by the petitioner/accused seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.499 of 2021 on the file of the learned Principal judicial First Class Magistrate, Armoor.

2. Heard Mr.Alluri Divakar Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Jithender Rao Veeramalla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1.

3. The specific allegation against the petitioner/accused is that he has procured PDS rice from the beneficiaries at cheaper rate to sell the same for profit and on 01.09.2021, the petitioner was found in possession of 5.95 quintals of PDS rice.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that without there being any complaint from any beneficiary, alleging that the

rice was procured deceptively or with a criminal intent and charging the petitioner for prosecution is untenable and improper. The allegations, even taken at his face value cannot be sustained against the petitioner. Further, this Court, in Crl.P.No.5709 of 2019, while considering the same situation, categorically observed that the offences alleged against the petitioners therein could not be continued and accordingly quashed the proceedings. The petitioner is also entitled to the same relief and hence prayed to quash the proceedings against the petitioner.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that as per prosecution, the offences said to have been committed by the petitioner is cheating and violation of Section 7 of the EC Act and requested to pass appropriate orders.

6. Section 7 of the EC Act contemplate that any person contravenes with the production, supply, distribution and trade of essential commodities, is punishable. As per the prosecution, the petitioner has procured PDS rice from the beneficiaries after supply from the dealer.

7. A Coordinate Bench of this Court in Crl.P.No.7227 of 2025 has considered the identical facts and observed that:

"There is no averment indicating that the petitioner in any way deceptively induced the beneficiaries to part with the supplied PDS rice or the beneficiary entrusted the PDS rice purchased by them with the petitioner and they dishonestly misappropriated or converted to their own use or used it in violation of a lawful direction or contract. In the absence of essential factors, on the face of prosecution, this Court finds it to be a fit case to exercise the jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023. Thus, continuance of proceedings against the petitioner is abuse of process of law".

8. The facts and circumstances of the present case also similar to those in the above case and hence, this Court finds it to be a fit case to exercise jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS by applying the same analogy and to quash the proceedings against the petitioner herein.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed and the proceedings in C.C.No.499 of 2021 on the file of the learned Principal judicial First Class Magistrate, Armoor, against the petitioner/accused, are hereby quashed.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

SD/- K.BHAVANI SWAMY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Judicial First-Class Magistrate at Armoor.
2. The Station House Officer, Balkonda Police Station, Nizamabad District.
3. Two CCs to the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
4. One CC to Sri Alluri Divakar Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies

CC - TODAY

HIGH COURT

DATED: 28/04/2026

ORDER

CRLP.No.6548 of 2026

ALLOWING THE CRIMINAL PETITION

(8) copies

PVL

01/05/2026