

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI**

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.12835 & 8884 of 2015**CRIMINAL PETITION No.12835 OF 2015****Between:**

1. Maddipoti Venkata Satya Ramu @ M.V.S.Ramu,
S/o.Maddipoti Satyanarayana Chowdary,
R/o.Bommuru Village, Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.
2. Maddipoti Sujatha,
W/o.Venkata Satya Ramu @ M.V.S.Ramu,
R/o.Bommuru Village, Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 & 2

And

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by S.H.O.,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District,
Represented by its Public Prosecutor.
2. Ch.N.V.V.Satyanarayana Reddy,
S/o.Subbi Reddy, R/o.CRC Road,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District.

... Respondents

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8884 OF 2015**Between:**

1. Maddipoti Satyanarayana Chowdary,
S/o.Venkata Rao, R/o.Bommuru Village,
Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.
2. Maddipoti Varalaxmi,
W/o.Satyanarayana Chowdary,
R/o.Bommuru Village,
Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.3 & 4

And



1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by S.H.O.,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District,
Represented by its Public Prosecutor.
2. Ch.N.V.V.Satyanarayana Reddy,
S/o.Subbi Reddy, R/o.CRC Road,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District.

... Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: **03-05-2023**

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE DUPPALA VENKATA RAMANA

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 His Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

DUPPALA VENKATA RAMANA, J



*** THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE DUPPALA VENKATA RAMANA**

+ CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.12835 & 8884 of 2015

% 03-05-2023

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12835 OF 2015

Between:

1. Maddipoti Venkata Satya Ramu @ M.V.S.Ramu,
S/o.Maddipoti Satyanarayana Chowdary,
R/o.Bommuru Village, Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.
 2. Maddipoti Sujatha,
W/o.Venkata Satya Ramu @ M.V.S.Ramu,
R/o.Bommuru Village, Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.
- ... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 & 2

And

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by S.H.O.,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District,
Represented by its Public Prosecutor.
2. Ch.N.V.V.Satyanarayana Reddy,
S/o.Subbi Reddy, R/o.CRC Road,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District. ... Respondents

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8884 OF 2015

Between:

1. Maddipoti Satyanarayana Chowdary,
S/o.Venkata Rao, R/o.Bommuru Village,
Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.
 2. Maddipoti Varalaxmi,
W/o.Satyanarayana Chowdary,
R/o.Bommuru Village,
Rajahmundry Rural Mandal,
East Godavari District.
- ... Petitioners/Accused Nos.3 & 4

And



1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by S.H.O.,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District,
Represented by its Public Prosecutor.
2. Ch.N.V.V.Satyanarayana Reddy,
S/o.Subbi Reddy, R/o.CRC Road,
Ravulapalem, East Godavari District.

.... Respondents

! Counsel for Petitioners : Sri N.Aswini Kumar

^ Counsel for Respondents : Asst.Public Prosecutor
- 1st respondent
Sri T.V.Jaggireddy
- 2nd respondent

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

2019 (3) ALT (Cri.) 22 (SC)

AIR 1992 SC 604

(2013) 11 SCC 673

(2015) 8 SCC 293

2021 SCC Online SC 942

2021 SCC Online SC 976

This Court made the following:



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE DUPPALA VENKATA RAMANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.12835 & 8884 of 2015

COMMON ORDER:

Criminal Petition No.12835 of 2015 is filed by the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2, under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short "Cr.P.C") praying to quash the proceedings against them in C.C.No.302 of 2015 on the file of the Court of Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kothapeta, East Godavari District, for the offences under Sections 406, 409, 417, 420 and 471 read with 34 IPC.

Criminal Petition No.8884 of 2015 is filed by the Petitioners/Accused Nos.3 and 4, under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short "Cr.P.C") praying to quash the proceedings against them in C.C.No.302 of 2015 pending on the file of the Court of Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kothapeta, East Godavari District, for the offences under Sections 406, 409, 417, 420 and 471 read with 34 IPC.

2. Since both the criminal petitions are arising out of C.C.No.302 of 2015 and raising common questions of law, they have been heard together and are being decided by this common order.



3. For the sake of convenience, the parties are hereinafter referred to as they are arrayed before the trial Court in C.C.No.302 of 2015.

4. The marshalling of facts upon perusal of the complaint and other material available at this stage is that A.1 – Maddipoti Venkata Satya Ramu and A.2 – Sujatha are husband and wife respectively. A.3 – Maddipoti Satyanarayana Chowdary and A.4 – Maddipoti Vara Lakshmi are husband and wife respectively and parents of A.1 and A.1, A.2 and A.4 are the Directors of Maddipoti Consultants Private Limited. A.1 is also the Director of PGM Infrastructures Private Limited.

(ii) The complainant, Chinnam Naga Venkata Satyanarayana Reddy, is the Managing Director of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited, which is registered under the Companies Act. On 31.08.2008, M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited appointed M/s.JBRK & Co., Limited as Auditors to audit the accounts of the Company for the financial year 2007-2008. A.1 (ACA Membership No.20765) and one Praveen (ACA Membership No.204968), who are the Chartered Accountants and the partners of M/s.JBRK & Co., Limited, attended the audit of the said Company and subsequently, A.1 took active role in the financial activities of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited



and gained confidence of the Company. Thus, M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited issued 1,50,000 equity shares each of Rs.10/- to A.2, who is the wife of A.1 and 1,39,400 shares to L.W.5 – Hanumanthavarjula Ratna Prasad. Later, they have joined as Additional Directors of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited. Subsequently, they became the Directors of the Company from 28.08.2011.

(iii) The *de facto* Complainant and his brother reposed trust and confidence in A.1 as he happened to be the Auditor and A.1 gained access to various financial transactions of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited. Taking advantage of his position as a Director of the Company, A.1 took over the steering of the financial matters of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited and fraudulently, misrepresented to TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai as if he is the Managing Director of the Company and obtained loan and also withdrew the amounts and diverted them wrongfully to his accounts.

(iv) On 12.11.2011, A.1 with a fraudulent intention to cheat the Company, approached TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai, for obtaining term loan of Rs.10.00 crores and put his signature as Managing Director of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited, though he was not a Managing Director of M/s.Soubhagya



Projects Private Limited, by showing himself as one of the guarantors and A.4 as the 2nd guarantor. As per Bylaws of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited, at least two Directors have to sign on any funding documents, but TATA Capital Limited accepted the representation sent by A.1, processed the loan formalities by accepting documents submitted by A.1 and sanctioned the loan of Rs.10.00 crores on 12.01.2012.

(v) A.1 and A.2, who are husband and wife, created a fake resolution dt.16.01.2012 by using the Company letter head by forging the signatures of the *de facto* Complainant and his brother as if A.1 was authorized to operate the bank account in Axis Bank, T.Nagar, Rajahmundry. On 20.01.2012 A.1 gave requisition to TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai, as if he is an authorized signatory and Managing Director of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited for remitting the term loan of Rs.5.00 crores in the Axis Bank Current Account No.107010200010487 belongs to M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited. On the same day, the said amount was remitted by TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai. On 21.01.2012, A.1 diverted an amount of Rs.2.00 crores to the Axis Bank account No.107010200007887 of Maddipoti Consultants Private Limited, which belongs to A.1 and A.3 and Rs.3.00 crores into the Axis Bank account



No.515010200000912 of PGM Infrastructure Limited, which belongs to A.1. The bank officials believed the fake/forged resolution submitted by A.1 as genuine.

(vi) Similarly, on 04.02.2012 A.1 gave a requisition to TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai, with fake Company seal as if he is an authorized signatory of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited and obtained remaining term loan amount of Rs.5.00 crores from TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai, through Axis Bank Current Account No.107010200010487 of the Company. On the same day, A.1 diverted Rs.3.00 crores into another Axis Bank Account No.10701030000343 of Maddipoti Consultants Private Limited belongs to A.1 and A.3 and Rs.2.00 crores into the Axis Bank Account No.515010200000912 of PGM Infrastructure Limited belongs to A.1 by using the cheques. A.1, thus, diverted the amount of Rs.10.00 crores which belongs to M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited, to his firms. It is a clear violation and breach of trust. A.2 to A.4 acted in connivance with A.1. After coming to know the fraudulent transactions and misappropriation of funds, L.W.1 – Chinnam Naga Venu Venkata Satyanarayana Reddy, gave a report to the Police on 05.01.2013 and the same was registered as a case in Crime No.3 of 2013 of Ravulapalem Police Station, against A.1 to A.4 for the



offences under Sections 406, 409, 417, 420 and 471 read with 34 IPC.

(vii) The crime was investigated and eventually having found *prima facie* evidence against A.1 to A.4, during investigation, the Investigating Officer obtained the signatures of L.W.1 – Chinnam Naga Venu Venkata Satyanarayana Reddy and L.W.2 – Chinnam Chandra Reddy in the presence of Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kothapeta and sent them to the Hand Writing Expert, FSL, Hyderabad, to compare with the signatures on the Board Resolution dated 16.01.2012 passed by M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited as if A.1 was authorized to operate the account of the Company. Hand Writing Expert issued opinion dated 24.10.2014 that the signatures of L.W.1 – Chinnam Naga Venu Venkata Satyanarayana Reddy and L.W.2 – Chinnam Chandra Reddy were compared with the questioned signatures and opined that the signatures are different between questioned and standard signatures.

(viii) Basing on the oral and documentary evidence available on record, the Investigating Officer had filed charge sheet in the trial Court, against A.1 to A.4. The said case is now pending before the Trial Court in C.C.No.302 of 2015.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the criminal petitions submitted that the entire dispute is revolving civil in nature and criminal case ought not have been filed and also the learned Magistrate ought not have taken cognizance against the accused Nos.1 to 4 as the matter is purely civil in nature. It is further submitted that the complainant has to approach the concerned Tribunal, which is an appropriate forum and as none of the ingredients of the offences mentioned in the charge sheet are attracted, the criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 are liable to be quashed. He would submit that there is no *prima facie* case made out so as to conduct the investigation and not proved upon the collection of evidence by the Investigating Officer. Therefore, the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have not committed the alleged offences. He would further submit that a proper evolution of the material on record would disclose that the complaint is frivolous. Further, he would submit that the dispute is certainly of a civil nature and the ingredients of the offences that are alleged against Accused Nos.1 to 4 are not made out the criminal proceedings against them and initiation of criminal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of Court. Therefore, he would



pray to quash the charge sheet against the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4.

6. Learned counsel for the 2nd respondent would submit that the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have conspired with each other in order to commit the offences of cheating, forgery for the purpose of cheating and using a forged document as genuine. Therefore, the Investigating Officer examined the appropriate witnesses and sent the Board Resolution dated 16.01.2012 to the hand writing expert. The signatures of L.Ws.1 and 2 were compared with the questioned signatures and opined that signatures are different between questioned and standard. He would further submit that the criminal proceedings initiated against the accused are as per law and therefore, there is no abuse of process of the Court. He would further submit that having granted stay by this Court, the accused tried to take a chance for discharging them in C.C.No.302 of 2015 and filed CrI.M.P.No.4065 of 2015, and the same was dismissed by the trial Court 30.04.2019, and the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have not challenged the order of the learned Magistrate and the same has become final. Therefore, the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 having committed the offences and having involved in a financial scam, by forging the resolution dated 16.01.2012,



cannot claim to quash the present criminal proceedings. He further submitted that, during investigation, found that there is *prima facie* case proved upon collection of evidences and came to the conclusion that the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have committed the alleged offences. Therefore, the Investigating Officer laid charge sheet, which itself fortifies the gravity that the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have committed the alleged offences and therefore, this Court does not have power to decide the disputed facts involved in the case as it is the complete domain of the trial Court. Therefore, he would pray for dismissal of both the criminal petitions.

7. In a decision reported in **Chilakamarthi Venkateswarlu & Another Vs. State of A.P., & Another**¹, it is held as follows:

13. The inherent jurisdiction, though wide and expansive, has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the section itself, that is, to make orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under [the Code](#), to prevent the abuse of the process of any Court or to otherwise secure the ends of justice.

14.

15. In exercising jurisdiction under [Section 482](#) it is not permissible for the Court to act as if it were a trial Court. The Court is only to be prima facie satisfied about existence of sufficient ground for proceeding against the

¹ 2019 (3) ALT (Cri.) 22 (SC)



accused. For that limited purpose, the Court can evaluate materials and documents on record, but it cannot appreciate the evidence to conclude whether the materials produced are sufficient or not for convicting the accused.

8. In a decision reported in **State of Haryana & Others Vs. Ch.Bhajanlal and Others**² the Hon'ble Apex Court considered in detail the powers of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C to quash the criminal proceedings/FIR. The Hon'ble Apex Court summarized the legal position by laying down the following guidelines to be followed by the High Courts in exercise of their inherent powers to quash the criminal complaint.

(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 F.I.R. 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;

² (7) AIR 1992 SC 604



(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;

(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.

9. In view of the above said authoritative principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, coming to the case on hand, as discussed supra, there are several factual aspects, which are to be decided during the trial by the trial Court. On perusal of the charge sheet, it *prima facie* discloses the offences alleged against the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 in both the criminal petitions. The correctness or otherwise of the said allegations has to be decided only during trial. At the initial stage of issuance of process, it is not open to Courts to stifle proceedings by entering into the merits of the contentions made on behalf of the accused. Criminal complaints could not be quashed only on the ground that the allegations made therein appear to be of civil nature. If the ingredients of the offence



alleged against the accused are *prima facie* made out in the charge sheet, the criminal proceedings shall not be interdicted.

10. Though the learned counsel for the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 relied on the judgments in **Paramjeet Batra Vs. State of Uttarakhand³, Vesa Holdings Private Limited Vs. State of Kerala⁴, Randheer Singh Vs. The State of U.P & Others⁵ and Mitesh Kumar J.Sha Vs. The State of Karnataka & Others⁶**, having regard to the facts of the case and evidence on record of the case on hand, this Court is of the opinion that the said judgments are not helpful to the case of the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4. A given set of facts may make out a civil wrong as also a criminal offence and only because a civil remedy may be available to the complainant that itself cannot be a ground to quash a criminal proceeding.

11. In the present case of nature, the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2 forged the signatures of the *de facto* complainant and his brother, created fake resolution dt.16.01.2012 by using the Company Letter Heads, as if Accused No.1 was authorized to operate the bank account of the Company in Axis Bank and with a fraudulent intention approached TATA Capital

³ (2013) 11 SCC 673

⁴ (2015) 8 SCC 293

⁵ 2021 SCC Online SC 942

⁶ 2021 SCC Online SC 976



Limited, Mumbai, A.1 put his signatures as the Managing Director of the Company for remitting the term loan of Rs.5.00 crores in the Axis Bank Current Account No.107010200010487 belongs to the Company and on the same day i.e., on 20.01.2012 the said amount was remitted by TATA Capital Limited. On 21.01.2012 A.1 diverted an amount of Rs.2.00 crores to the Axis Bank account No.107010200007887 of Maddipoti Consultants Private Limited, which belongs to A.1 and A.3 and A.1 diverted Rs.3.00 crores into another Axis Bank account No.10701030000912 of PGM Infrastructures Limited belongs to A.1 and A.3 and similarly on 04.02.2012 A.1 gave a requisition to TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai, with fake Company seal as if he is an authorized signatory of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited and obtained remaining term loan amount of Rs.5.00 crores from TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai through Axis Bank Current Account No.107010200010487 of the Company. On the same day, A.1 diverted Rs.3.00 crores into another Axis Bank Account No.10701030000343 of Maddipoti Consultants Private Limited belongs to A.1 and A.3 and Rs.2.00 crores into the Axis Bank Account No.515010200000912 of PGM Infrastructure Limited belongs to A.1 by using the cheques. A.1, thus, diverted the



amount of Rs.10.00 crores which belongs to M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited, to his firms referred to above.

12. The alleged fake resolution, dated 16.01.2012, was forwarded to the FSL with the signatures of *de facto* complainant and his brother for comparison with the questioned signatures and the Hand Writing Expert opined that there is a difference in the questioned and the standard signatures and issued opinion dt.24.10.2014. Therefore, the signatures on the alleged fake resolution are not that of the *de facto* complainant and his brother, which were forged, as per the scientific evidence.

13. The said allegations made in the FIR and the charge sheet and the evidence collected, disclose the commission of offence by the accused, hence, the criminal proceedings cannot be quashed at this stage and this Court satisfied that the accused knowing fully well that the resolution dated 16.01.2012 is fabricated by them and presented on behalf of M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited before TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai, withdrew the amount of Rs.10.00 crores, remitted to their personal accounts as stated above and the accused have not only cheated M/s.Soubhagya Projects Private Limited, but also cheated TATA Capital Limited, Mumbai with a deceptive intention and at the



inception created forged and fabricated document shown as genuine.

14. In a decision reported in **Sau.Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekar Vs. State of Maharashtra and others**⁷, Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, held as follows:

“5. Quashing the criminal proceedings is called for only in a case where the complaint does not disclose any offence, or is frivolous, vexatious, or oppressive. If the allegations set out in the complaint do not constitute the offence of which cognizance has been taken by the Magistrate, it is open to the High Court to quash the same. It is not necessary that a meticulous analysis of the case should be done before the Trial to find out whether the case would end in conviction or acquittal. If it appears on a reading of the complaint and consideration of the allegations therein, in the light of the statement made on oath that the ingredients of the offence are disclosed, there would be no justification for the High Court to interfere.

9., we are of the considered view that the High Court ought not to have set aside the order passed by the Trial Court issuing summons to the Respondents. A perusal of the complaint discloses that prima facie, offences that are alleged against the Respondents. The correctness or otherwise of the said allegations has to be decided only in the Trial. At the initial stage of issuance of process it is not open to the Courts to stifle the proceedings by entering into the merits of the contentions made on behalf of the accused. Criminal complaints cannot be quashed only on the ground that the allegations made therein appear to be of a civil nature. If the ingredients of the offence alleged against the accused are prima facie made out in the complaint, the criminal proceeding shall not be interdicted.”

15. In the light of the above decision, considering the filing of charge sheet itself *prima facie* fortifies the fact that the allegations made in the charge sheet that all the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 in the above criminal petitions

⁷ 2019 (1) ALT (CrI.) 211 (SC)



have conspired to each other and committed the alleged offences. Therefore, in this regard, even though it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 that the entire case is civil in nature, at the same time, there are allegations made out as alleged offences of forgery, fabrication of documents, cheating and using a forged document as genuine. Therefore, it cannot be said that there is an abuse of process of the Court so as to quash the proceedings initiated against the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4.

16. In the present case, the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 tried to get over from the criminal proceedings and during pendency of the stay granted by this Court, filed an application in CrI.M.P.No.4065 of 2015 in C.C.302 of 2015 before the trial Court to discharge them from the alleged offences in the said criminal case. The learned Magistrate discussed at length and dismissed the petition opining that the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have failed to prove the plea taken by them and they cannot be discharged at this stage. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 have not carried out the matter to the Appellate Court. Therefore, it *prima facie* shows that the element of criminal acts were done in the present case and further after investigation, the investigating officer had filed charge sheet,



which fortifies the facts that the acts which are criminal in nature were done, which is liable to be decided during the full-fledged trial in criminal proceedings. Therefore, the correctness and otherwise of the said allegations have to be decided only during full-fledged trial, but not at this stage. The criminal complaint *prima facie* makes the allegations of criminal liability and furthermore, in the present case, the said fact is fortified by filing of charge sheet by the investigating officer and in such an event, criminal complaints cannot be quashed. Even though the disputes are found to be civil in nature as alleged, where the allegations of forgery and fabrication of documents are involved, using forged document as genuine i.e., Board Resolution dated 16.01.2012 and diverting funds of Rs.10.00 crores to the firms of A.1 to A.4 as stated above, initiation of criminal proceedings cannot be quashed.

17. Upon considering the entire materials and for the reasons above stated and after following the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bhajanlal's case (supra)*, this Court is of the opinion that none of the principles are suited to this case for quashing. Hence, with the above, this Court has come to a conclusion that the allegations made in the charge sheet in C.C.No.302 of 2015, are sufficient enough for the trial to be



taken up and thereby, the criminal proceedings are not advisable to be quashed. Therefore, this Court does not find any abuse of process of the Court in initiating criminal proceedings against the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4 in the above criminal petitions.

18. Therefore, the Criminal Petition No.12835 of 2015 filed by petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2 and Criminal Petition No.8884 of 2015 filed by petitioners/Accused Nos.3 and 4 arising out of C.C.No.302 of 2015, are liable to be dismissed.

19. Resultantly, Criminal Petition Nos.12835 of 2015 and 8884 of 2015 arising out of C.C.No.302 of 2015, lack merit and stand dismissed.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand disposed of.

JUSTICE DUPPALA VENKATA RAMANA

Date: 03.05.2023

DNS

Mjl/*



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE DUPPALA VENKATA RAMANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.12835 & 8884 of 2015

03.05.2023

DNS

*Mjl/ **