

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

**TUESDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 838 OF 2024

Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 and 442 of BNSS Act against the Order dated 24.04.2024 passed in CrIMp No.535 of 2024 in CC No.9501 of 2021 on the file of the Court of the XV Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad.

Between:

Tayyaba Parveen, W/o. Mohammed Rafeeq Ahmed, Aged about 60 years,
Occ: Housewife, R/o. H.No. 10- 3- 2/A, Flat No.103, I Floor, Metro Plaza
Apartments, Mehdiapatnam Hyderabad.

...Petitioners/Accused No.2

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Hyderabad through SHO, Women Police Station, CCS, DD, Hyderabad.
2. Hoor Unnisa, W/o Mohammed Raheel Ahmed Aged about 30 years Occ: Housewife R/o H No 8- 1- 347/B/29 1st Floor Aziz Bagh Tolichowki Golconda Hyderabad

...Respondents/Defacto Complainant

I.A. No. 1 of 2024

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings in C. C. No. 9501 of 2021 on the file of the Hon'ble XV Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Hyderabad pending disposal of Criminal Revision Case.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI M A MUJEEB

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI D ARUN KUMAR,
ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR**

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: SRI SADDULA SHAREEF

The Court made the following: ORDER

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUDANA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.838 of 2024

27.01.2026

Between:

Tayyaba Parveen.

PETITIONER

AND

State of Telangana,
Rep by Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of
Telangana, at Hyderabad,
And another.

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

This revision case is filed by revision petitioner/accused No.2 challenging the order dated 24.04.2024 passed in CrI.MP.No.535 of 2024 in CC.No.9501 of 2021 on the file of the Xv Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, at Hyderabad. The said CrI.MP., was filed seeking discharge of petitioner from the offences alleged against him under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act. Aggrieved by dismissal of the said petition, this revision is preferred.

2. Heard Sri MA.Mujeeb, learned counsel for revision petitioner, and Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent No.1, and Sri Saddula Shareef, learned counsel for respondent No.2.
3. Learned counsel for revision petitioner submitted that the trial Court erred in dismissing the application for discharge without assigning any reasons or addressing the contentions raised by the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner and de facto complainant had already filed joint memo for compromising the matter and that except vague allegations there is no material on record to frame charge against the petitioner. Therefore, while advocating that the petitioner is innocent of the offences as alleged, he prayed this Court to allow this revision case, setting aside the impugned order and discharging the petitioner.
4. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, and learned counsel for respondent No.2, respectively, opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for revision petitioner and asserted that the trial Court had rightly dismissed the discharge petition and there are no illegalities or irregularities in the impugned order. Therefore, prayed this Court to dismiss the revision case.
5. Having regard to rival submissions made, and on going through the material placed on record, it is noted that the allegations against the petitioner are that she along with A1 had demanded a flat and

Rs.5,00,000/- as additional dowry and as the father of complainant refused it, the petitioner had allegedly abused complainant and her father and also necked out the complainant saying unless she brings additional dowry, she cannot enter into house. That apart, the material on record would show that the allegations against the A1 are with regarding to abusing, torturing and threatening complainant. According to complainant, she was informed that A1 had married another woman two years back. That being so, it can be observed that there are primary allegations against A1 and not against this petitioner.

6. In view thereof, this criminal revision case is allowed, setting aside the order dated 24.04.2024 passed in CrI.MP.No.535 of 2024 in CC.No.9501 of 2021 and discharging the petitioner, accused No.2 in CC.No.9501 of 2021.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

SD/- K.MADHAVI
ASS STANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The XV Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad
2. The XIII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad
3. The Station House Officer, WPS, CCS, DD Police Station, Hyderabad
4. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
5. One CC to Sri M A Mujeeb, Advocate [OPUC]
6. One CC to Sri Saddula Shareef, Advocate [OPUC]
7. Two CD Copies



ABK /PSL

HIGH COURT

PDATED: 27/01/2026

ORDER

CRLRC.No.838 of 2024



ALLOWING THE CRIMINAL REVISION CASE

(10) MT
11/2/26