

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA
PRADESH :: AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)



APHC010239692020

THURSDAY ,THE FIRST DAY OF 3396
FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY
FOUR

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 3642 OF 2020

Between:

1. K K MURTHY, S/o.Sri K.Satti Raju Hindu, aged 45 years, Occ.Business, R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
2. Kavala Venkata Naga Durga Siva Prasad @ Durgam, S/o.Late Sri K.Venkata Rao Hindu, aged 49 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
3. K.Veerababu, S/o.Sri K.V.N.d.Siva Prasad Hindu, aged 24 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
4. K.Nagendra Babu, S/o.Sri K.Anjaneyulu Hindu, aged 28 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
5. Adapa Pushkaram, S/o.Sri A.bhushanam Hindu, aged 25 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
6. Adapa Bhushanam, S/o.Late Sri A.Tirupathi Rao Hindu, aged 61 years, Occ.Cultivation R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Station House Officer Sithanagaram Police Station Sithanagaram, East Godavari District Rep.by public prosecutor, High Court, Amaravathi
2. Induguvalli Prasad, S/o.Sri I.Gangaraju Hindu, aged 22 years Occ.Nil, R/o.Madigapeta Munikudali Village Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANTS

Petition under Section 437/438/439/482 of Cr.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court to call for the records in FIR No.257/2020 on the file of the Station House Officer, Sithanagaram Police Station, Sithanagaram, East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh and quash the same in so far as the petitioners/A-1 to A-6 are concerned as the same is illegal and abuse of process of law and pass

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2020

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C 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 including arrest of the petitioners/A-1 to A-6 in FIR No.257/2020 on the file of the Station House Officer, Sithanagaram Police Station, Sithanagaram, East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh pending disposal of this criminal petition and pass

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri TURAGA SAI SURYA, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor (TG/AP) on behalf of the Respondent No. and of Sri_Advocate for the Respondent No.

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The instant petition under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973¹ has been filed by the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 6, seeking quashment of proceedings against them in Crime No.257 of 2020 on the file of Seethanagaram Police station, Seethanagaram, East Godavari District, which was registered for the offences under Sections 324, 323 and 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code² and Section 3(1)(e) and 3 (2) (va) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.³

¹ for short 'Cr.P.C'

² for short 'IPC'

³ for short 'the Act'

2. The facts mentioned in the complaint, in brief, are as follows;

a. Respondent No.2/*de facto* complainant is a resident of Munikudali Village of Seethanagaram Mandal. He is the youngest, among three sons to his parents. On 18.07.2020 at about 7.30 p.m., an accident occurred near tank at Munikudali Village, in which, the rider of the bike namely Vijay sustained leg injury, since a lorry dashed him. When the *de facto* complainant was trying to shift the injured by an auto, Petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 belonging to Rajampeta Village, came on a car and started blowing horn. When he was asked to wait for five minutes, Accused No.1 opened the car door forcibly, due to which the *de facto* complainant, who was standing beside the door, sustained a bleeding injury on his mouth. The *de facto* complainant in a fit of anger, fisted on the front glass of the car. Then Accused No.1 abused me saying that "*labour lanjakodaka*" and all the accused quarreled and threatened that they will see his end and also stated that they would tonsure his head.

b. While so, on 20.07.2020 at around 1.00 pm., S.I and one constable of Seethanagaram Police Station and a person belonging to Accused No.1 took the *de facto* complainant to the police station, where the S.I of Police beat the *de facto* complainant on his cheek and pulled out the underwear and beat on his buttocks and feet. S.I of Police called barber to the police station and got tonsured the *de facto* complainant and also threatened to register a theft case against him, if he revealed about the said incident to anybody.

c. Thereafter, the *de facto* complainant gave a complaint to the Police against the accused, which was registered as a case in Crime No.257 of 2020 of

Seethanagaram Police Station. The said Crime is sought to be quashed in this Crl.P. Hence, Petition.

Grounds sought for Quashment

3. Aggrieved by the registration of the said case, the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 6 filed the present petition seeking quashment of the said crime on the following grounds:

- a. The allegations mentioned in the complaint do not disclose that the petitioners have abused the *de facto* complainant by referring to his caste name with an intention to cause humiliation to him. In the absence of any such allegation, registration of FIR for the alleged offences against the petitioners is nothing but an abuse of process of law.
- b. The offence under Section 3(1)(e) of the Act has no application in so far as the petitioners are concerned and it may attract against Accused No.7.
- c. To attract an offence under Section 3 (2) (va) of the Act, there should be a *prima facie* attracting the provisions of IPC as specified in the Schedule, but no such case is made out for the alleged offences. Therefore, continuation of the proceedings against the petitioners is an abuse of process of law
- d. That the present crime has been registered with false allegations as a counterblast to the case in Crime No.256 of 2020, which was registered basing on the report given by Petitioner No.5/Accused No.5.

Arguments Advanced at the Bar

4. Heard Sri Turaga Sai Surya, learned counsel for the petitioners, Ms.D.Prasanna Lakshmi learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for

State/Respondent No.1 and Sri Jada Sravan Kumar, learned counsel for Respondent No.2.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 6 would submit that it is a false case foisted against the petitioners as a counterblast to the case in CrimNo.256 of 2020, which was registered against the *de facto* complainant and his followers based on the report given by Accused No.5 herein. He would further submit that Crime No.256 of 2020 has been registered on 19.07.2020 for the illegal acts committed by the *de facto* complainant on 18.07.2020 at 7.30 pm. The *de facto* complainant was arrested in the said crime by the Police and the petitioners have nothing to do with the acts said to have been committed by the Police. Therefore, continuation of criminal proceedings against the petitioners would be an abuse of process of law.

6. Refuting the arguments referred to above, learned counsel for Respondent No.2 would submit that the material available on record is sufficient to make out a case against the petitioners/A.1 to A.6. He would further submit that the Special Act to protect the people belonging to the Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribes has been brought with an avowed object of protecting vulnerable mass of the community, but the petitioners/A.1 to A.6 got insulted Respondent No.2 through the Police by removing his underwear, beating on his back and tonsuring his head etc., with an intention to humiliate him. He would further submit that it is not possible to ascertain the veracity of allegations at the inception, and the matter requires thorough investigation. He would submit that there is no merit in the contention of the petitioners that there are no allegations against these petitioners with regard to the commission of offence and hence, the application under

Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashment of proceedings against the petitioners cannot sustain at this stage. Hence, he would pray for dismissal of the criminal petition.

7. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor conceded to the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for Respondent No.2.

Point for Determination

8. Having heard the submissions of the learned counsel representing both the parties, now the point that would emerge for determination is:

Whether there are any justifiable grounds for quashment of proceedings against the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 6 in Crime No.257 of 2020 on the file of Seethanagaram Police station, Seethanagaram, East Godavari District, registered for the offences under Sections 324, 323 and 506 read with 34 of I.P.C. and Sections 3(1)(e) and 3 (2) (va) of the Act?

Determination by the Court

9. A bare perusal of Section 482 makes it clear that the Code envisages that inherent powers of the High Court are not limited or affected so as to make orders as may be necessary; (i) *to give effect to any order under the Code or, (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or, otherwise (iii) to secure ends of justice.* A court while sitting in Section 482 jurisdiction must exercise its powers to do real and substantial justice, depending on the facts and circumstances of case. These powers must be invoked for compelling reasons of abuse of process of law or glaring injustice, which are against sound principles of criminal jurisprudence.

10. Specific circumstances warranting the invocation of the provision must be present. The decision rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State of Haryana***

and others v. Bhajanlal and others⁴ is considered as the guiding torch in the application of Section 482. At paras 102 and 103, the circumstances are spelt out as follows;

“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

- (1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.*
- (2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.*
- (3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.*
- (4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.*
- (5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.*

4 AIR 1992 SC 604

(6) *Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.*

(7) *Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.*

103. *We also give a note of caution to the effect that the power of quashing a criminal proceeding should be exercised very sparingly and with circumspection and that too in the rarest of rare cases; that the court will not be justified in embarking upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR or the complaint and that the extraordinary or inherent powers do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the court to act according to its whim or caprice.”*

(emphasis supplied)

11. A three-Judge Bench of the Hon’ble Apex Court in ***Madhavrao Jiwajirao Scindia v. Sambhajirao Chandrojirao Angre***⁵ held as follows;

“The legal position is well settled that when a prosecution at the initial stage is asked to be quashed, the test to be applied by the court is as to whether the uncontroverted allegations as made prima facie establish the offence. It is also for the court to take into consideration any special features which appear in a particular case to consider whether it is expedient and in the interest of justice to permit a prosecution to continue. This is so on the basis that the court cannot be utilised for any oblique purpose and where in the opinion of the court chances of an ultimate conviction are bleak and, therefore, no useful purpose is likely to be served by allowing a criminal prosecution to continue, the court may while taking into consideration the special facts of a case also quash the proceeding even though it may be at a preliminary stage.”

(emphasis supplied)

⁵ (1988)1 SCC 692.

12. Section 482 is designed so as to ensure that criminal proceedings are not used as weapons of harassment by complainants. In ***Inder Mohan Goswami v. State of Uttaranchal***⁶, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows;

*“46. The court must ensure that criminal prosecution is not used as an instrument of harassment or for seeking private vendetta or with an ulterior motive to pressurise the accused. On analysis of the aforementioned cases, we are of the opinion that it is neither possible nor desirable to lay down an inflexible rule that would govern the exercise of inherent jurisdiction. **Inherent jurisdiction of the High Courts under Section 482 CrPC though wide has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when it is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the statute itself and in the aforementioned cases**”*

(emphasis supplied)

13. A three- Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra and others***, summarized the law for invocation on inherent powers in the following terms;

“57. From the aforesaid decisions of this Court, right from the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Khawaja Nazir Ahmad (supra), the following principles of law emerge:

- i) Police has the statutory right and duty under the relevant provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure contained in Chapter XIV of the Code to investigate into cognizable offences;*
- ii) Courts would not thwart any investigation into the cognizable offences;*
- iii) However, in cases where no cognizable offence or offence of any kind is disclosed in the first information report the Court will not permit an investigation to go on;*
- iv) The power of quashing should be exercised sparingly with circumspection, in the 'rarest of rare cases'. (The rarest of rare cases standard in its application for quashing under Section 482 Cr. P.C. is not to be confused with the norm which has been formulated in the context of the death penalty, as explained previously by this Court);*
- v) While examining an FIR/complaint, quashing of which is sought, the court cannot embark upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR/complaint;*
- vi) Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage;*
- vii) Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception and a rarity than an ordinary rule;*

⁶ (2007) 12 SCC 1

- viii) *Ordinarily, the courts are barred from usurping the jurisdiction of the police, since the two organs of the State operate in two specific spheres of activities. The inherent power of the court is, however, recognised to secure the ends of justice or prevent the above of the process by Section 482 Cr. P.C.*
- ix) *The functions of the judiciary and the police are complementary, not overlapping;*
- x) *Save in exceptional cases where non-interference would result in miscarriage of justice, the Court and the judicial process should not interfere at the stage of investigation of offences;*
- xi) *Extraordinary and inherent powers of the Court do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the Court to act according to its whims or caprice;*
- xii) *The first information report is not an encyclopaedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. During or after investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure;*
- xiii) *The power under Section 482 Cr. P.C. is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the court to be cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the court;*
- xiv) *However, at the same time, the court, if it thinks fit, regard being had to the parameters of quashing and the self-restraint imposed by law, more particularly the parameters laid down by this Court in the cases of R.P. Kapur (supra) and Bhajan Lal (supra), has the jurisdiction to quash the FIR/complaint;*
- xv) *When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused, the court when it exercises the power under Section 482 Cr. P.C., only has to consider whether or not the allegations in the FIR disclose the commission of a cognizable offence and is not required to consider on merits whether the allegations make out a cognizable offence or not and the court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR."*

(emphasis supplied)

14. Perusal of the record would show that Respondent No.2/*de facto* complainant filed the present complaint alleging that, in consequence of the altercation that took place on 18.07.2020 at about 7.30 p.m., between Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 6 and the *de facto* complainant, Petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 being the President of Munikudali Village, influenced the

Police and brought the *de facto* complainant to the Police Station, forcibly. The S.I of Police, who is arrayed as Accused No.7 beat the *de facto* complainant with his hands on his cheek and with belt on both the hands, pulled his underwear down and beat on his buttocks, got tonsured his head and also threatened that a theft case would be filed against him.

15. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that, as a counterblast to the complaint lodged on 19.07.2020 by Petitioner No.5/Accused No.5 against Respondent No.2/*de facto* complainant herein and his followers, which was registered as a case in Crime No.256 of 2020 on 20.07.2020 for the offences under Sections 324, 354, 341, 427 and 506 read with 34 IPC, the present complaint has been filed by the *de facto* complainant.

16. It was alleged in the complaint in Crime No.256 of 2020 that, while the Petitioner No.5/Accused No.5 herein was going home, one Polimati Sandeep, Indugamilli Prasad (Respondent No.2 herein), Anil and Sandeep, abused him in filthy language and later he informed the same to the village elder i.e., Petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 herein. Meanwhile, the above said persons wrongfully restrained the car of the Petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 herein and damaged the front glass of the car. When Petitioner No.5/Accused No.5 herein rushed to the spot, they beat him with stones and sticks. One Ambati Ravi outraged the modesty of their women and threatened with dire consequences.

17. A bare perusal of the present complaint in Crime No.257 of 2020 would disclose that while the *de facto* complaint was shifting the injured in an accident, Petitioner No.1/Accused No.1, who came on a car was asked to wait for five minutes, and on that he opened the car door forcibly, due to which the *de facto*

complainant, who was standing beside the door, sustained a bleeding injury on his mouth. The *de facto* complainant having become angry, fisted on the front glass of the car of Accused No.1, due to which Accused No.1 abused him in filthy language in the name of his caste and all the accused threatened to see their end and also stated that he will tonsure his head. Whereas, perusal of the complaint in Crime No.256 of 2020 discloses the presence of the petitioners herein at the scene of offence at the relevant point of time.

18. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that, as a counterblast to the complaint lodged by Petitioner No.5/Accused No.5 in Crime No.256 of 2020 on 19.07.2020 against Respondent No.2/*de facto* complainant and his followers, the present complaint has been filed and that the petitioners have nothing to do with the acts said to have been committed by the Police. Without investigation, the truth or otherwise of the said allegations cannot be revealed. This is not a proper stage to consider the genuineness of the said allegations. Though the petitioners were not present at the time of commission of alleged offence by the Police in the Police Station, since the complaint reveals that the alleged offence committed by the Police in the Police Station on 20.07.2020 at about 1.00 p.m., was in consequence of the incident that took place on 18.07.2020 at about 7.30 p.m., at whose instigation, the S.I of Police has committed the alleged offence, must be looked into. Since these two crimes are case and counter-cases, there is every possibility of addition and deletion of persons subsequently. As such, the petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., cannot be decided based on presumptions and assumptions.

19. In a case of this nature, the Police must be permitted to complete the investigation and the Courts cannot thwart the investigation at a nascent stage. In an exceptional case of this nature, interference of this Court at the stage of investigation would result in miscarriage of justice. This Court is not relying on the merits of the case at this stage. Truthfulness or otherwise of the allegation, cannot be addressed to by this court. It cannot either screen or assess the material on record at this stage like a mini trial to conclude that the accusation fails. A bare perusal of the report shows the allegations against the petitioners require investigation, before any decision as to their veracity is taken. The case is not falling under any of the guidelines mentioned in *Bhajanlal's case (supra)*. Further, in view of the stay of all further proceedings in the present crime, investigation has been stalled at the initial stage.

20. In view of the gravity of the offence i.e., pulling out the underwear of the *de facto* complainant, beating on his buttocks and feet and tonsuring his head, the matter requires detailed investigation. Hence, it is not appropriate to intervene at this stage.

21. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is dismissed. However, after filing of charge sheet, the petitioners are at liberty to file fresh petition seeking quashment of charge sheet, if so advised.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date:01.02.2024

Note: L.R.Copy to be marked

Dinesh

HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Cri.P.No.3642 of 2020

Dt.01.02.2024

Note: L.R.Copy to be marked

Dinesh

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.3642 of 2020

Between:

1. K K MURTHY, S/o.Sri K.Satti Raju Hindu, aged 45 years, Occ.Business, R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
2. Kavala Venkata Naga Durga Siva Prasad @ Durgam, S/o.Late Sri K.Venkata Rao Hindu, aged 49 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
3. K.Veerababu, S/o.Sri K.V.N.d.Siva Prasad Hindu, aged 24 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
4. K.Nagendra Babu, S/o.Sri K.Anjaneyulu Hindu, aged 28 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
5. Adapa Pushkaram, S/o.Sri A.bhushanam Hindu, aged 25 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
6. Adapa Bhushanam, S/o.Late Sri A.Tirupathi Rao Hindu, aged 61 years, Occ.Cultivation R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Station House Officer Sithanagaram Police Station Sithanagaram, East Godavari District Rep.by public prosecutor, High Court, Amaravathi.
2. Induguvalli Prasad, S/o.Sri I.Gangaraju Hindu, aged 22 years Occ.Nil, R/o.Madigapeta Munikudali Village Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: **01.02.2024**

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?* Yes/No
2. *Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters / Journals?* Yes/No
3. *Whether Her Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?* Yes/No

JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

*** THE HON'BLE SMT.JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**

+ CRIMINAL PETITION No.3642 of 2020

% 01.02.2024

Between:

1. K K MURTHY, S/o.Sri K.Satti Raju Hindu, aged 45 years, Occ.Business, R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
2. Kavala Venkata Naga Durga Siva Prasad @ Durgam, S/o.Late Sri K.Venkata Rao Hindu, aged 49 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
3. K.Veerababu, S/o.Sri K.V.N.d.Siva Prasad Hindu, aged 24 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
4. K.Nagendra Babu, S/o.Sri K.Anjaneyulu Hindu, aged 28 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
5. Adapa Pushkaram, S/o.Sri A.bhushanam Hindu, aged 25 years, Occ.Business R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh
6. Adapa Bhushanam, S/o.Late Sri A.Tirupathi Rao Hindu, aged 61 years, Occ.Cultivation R/o.Door No.3-73 Munikudali Village, Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Station House Officer Sithanagaram Police Station Sithanagaram, East Godavari District Rep.by public prosecutor, High Court, Amaravathi.
2. Induguvalli Prasad, S/o.Sri I.Gangaraju Hindu, aged 22 years Occ.Nil, R/o.Madigapeta Munikudali Village Sithanagaram Mandal East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANTS

! Counsel for Petitioners : Sri Turaga Sai Surya

^ Counsel for Respondents : Assistant Public Prosecutor for R.1
Sri Jada Sravan Kumar for R.2

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1. AIR 1992 SC 604
2. (1988) 1SCC 692
3. (1988) 1SCC 692.

This Court made the following: