

(SHOW CAUSE NOTICE BEFORE ADMISSION)  
HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD

THURSDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J SREENIVAS RAO  
CRLP NO: 5697 OF 2026

**Between**

Smt. Madhavi Latha, W/o Viswanath Lompella.

.....Petitioner/Accused

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Represented by the Public Prosecutor High Court of Telangana
2. Smt. M. Aruna, W/o Satyanarayana Aged about. 43 years, Occ. Tailoring R/o Asmanghad, Malakpet, Hyderabad

**Respondents/De-facto Complainant**

WHEREAS the Petitioner above named through her Advocate SRI KAILASH NATH P S S presented this Petition under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. 2023, praying that in the circumstances stated in the GROUNDS filed in support of the CRIMINAL PETITION, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records in connection with of CC No. 6975 of 2024 pending on the file of the Court of VII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad, and quash the same.

AND WHEREAS the High Court upon perusing the petition and memorandum of grounds filed herein and upon hearing the arguments of SRI. KAILASH NATH P S S Advocate for the Petitioner and Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the respondent, directed issue of notice to the Respondents herein to show cause as to why this CRIMINAL PETITION should not be admitted.

You viz:

Smt. M. Aruna, W/o Satyanarayana Aged about. 43 years, Occ. Tailoring R/o Asmanghad, Malakpet, Hyderabad

are directed to show cause on or before 01.09.2026 to which date the case stands posted as to why in the circumstances set out in the petition and the memorandum of grounds filed therewith (copy enclosed) this CRIMINAL PETITION should not be admitted.

**I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed in support of the CRIMINAL PETITION, the High Court may be pleased to dispense with filing of the certified copies of CC No. 6975 of 2024 pending on the file of the Court of the VII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad, pending disposal of CRLP No 5697 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

**The Court made the following:**

**ORDER:**

**Notice before admission.**

**Learned Additional Public Prosecutor takes notice on behalf of respondent No.1.**

**Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice to respondent No.2 by way of Speed Post with Acknowledgment Due and file proof of service.**

**Mr. T.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Kailash Nath P.S.S, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed the alleged offences and has been falsely implicated in the present crime. Even according to the allegations made in the complaint or in the final report, the ingredients of the offences under Sections 186, 171(C), 505(1)(c) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, IPC) and Section 132 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (for short, 'RP Act') are not attracted. He further submitted that the petitioner has not obstructed the official duties of respondent No.2. The petitioner has raised an objection about the identity of the voter. The said voter had not lodged any complaint. On the other hand, respondent No.2 lodged the present complaint for the offence under Section 186 of IPC which is a non-cognizable offence. The Investigating Officer without obtaining prior permission required under Section 155(2) read with 195 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 registered the crime and conducted investigation and the same is contrary to law. He further submitted that the learned Magistrate without recording satisfaction or assigning any reasons, has taken cognizance against the accused and issued summons and the same is contrary to the principles laid down**

by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Sunil Bharati Mittal v. Central Bureau of Investigation*<sup>1</sup> and *Fakhruddin Ahmad v. State of Uttaranchal and another*<sup>2</sup>.

In support of his contention, learned Senior Counsel relied upon the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Umashankar Yadav and another v. State of Uttar Pradesh and another*<sup>3</sup>, *Phudki Applicant v. State of opposite party*<sup>4</sup> and *M.Anbalagam v. State*<sup>5</sup>.

Taking into consideration the above submissions, this Court is of the view that detailed examination is required for adjudication of the case.

Post on 01.09.2026.

Till such time, there shall be an interim stay of all further proceedings against the petitioner/accused in C.C.No.6975 of 2024 of VII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad.

In default of filing proof of service by the next date of hearing, the interim stay granted shall stand vacated.

Sd/- M.OSMAN ALI BAIG  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

  
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. VII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad
2. Smt. M. Aruna, W/o Satyanarayana Aged about. 43 years, Occ. Tailoring R/o Asmanghad, Malakpet, Hyderabad  
[By SPAD-along with a copy of petition and memorandum of grounds]
3. One CC to Sri. KAILASH NATH P S S Advocate [OPUC]

---

<sup>1</sup> (2015) 4 SCC 609

<sup>2</sup> (2008) 17 SCC 157

<sup>3</sup> AIROnline 2025 SC 358

<sup>4</sup> 1955 CRI. L.J. 278

<sup>5</sup> 1981 CRI. L.J. 1179

4. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR High Court for the State of Telangana,  
at Hyderabad [OUT]
5. One spare copy

**HIGH COURT**

**JSR, J**

**DATED: 16-04-2026**

**POST ON 01.09.2026**

**NOTICE BEFORE ADMISSION  
CRLP.No.5697 of 2026**

**CRLP.No.5697 of 2026**

**INTERIM STAY**

