

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**MONDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO**

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.VIJAYSEN REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 35118 OF 2022

Between:

Syed Imran, S/o. Late Syed Kamal, Aged about 35 years, Occ. Private Employee,
R/o H.No.4-8-86/5, Near Old Rushi School, Manjeera Nagar, Sangareddy District.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary (Home), Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Sangareddy District.
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sangareddy Division, Sanga Reddy District.
4. The Station House Officer, Sangareddy Town, Sangareddy District.

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue order, or orders, more particularly one in the nature of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents herein in opening the rowdy sheet against the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary, in violation of articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, in violation of principles of natural justice besides law laid down by this Hon'ble Court in similar matters and consequently direct the respondents herein to close the rowdy sheet which was open against the petitioner forthwith.

IA NO: 1 OF 2022

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the respondents here n to close the rowdy sheet which was open against the petitioner in a year best known to the respondents forthwith pending disposal of the above writ petition pending disposal of the above writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI KATIKA RAVINDER REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: AGP FOR HOME

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.35118 of 2022

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the rowdy sheet was opened against the petitioner on the basis of five cases.

3. In the counter filed by the respondent No.3, it is stated that the petitioner was involved in the following crimes:

1. Cr.No.322 of 2009 registered for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 307 read with 149 IPC with the Sangareddy Town Police Station.
2. Cr.No.259 of 2012 registered for the offences under Sections 324, 427, 504, 506 read with 34 IPC with the Sangareddy Town Police Station.
3. Cr.No.29 of 2013 registered for the offences under Sections 353, 504 and 506 IPC with the Sangareddy Town Police Station.
4. Cr.No.49 of 2013 registered for the offences under Sections 447 and 427 IPC with the Sangareddy Town Police Station.
5. Cr.No.113 of 2013 registered for the offence under Section 307 read with 34 IPC.

4. It is further stated that out of the aforesaid five cases, four crimes ended in acquittal and one crime i.e. Cr.No.259 of 2012

ended in compromise. The rowdy sheet is being renewed from time to time and the activities of the petitioner are under surveillance of the respondent police. The acquittal of the petitioner was due to the witnesses turning hostile. There is no possibility of false implication of the petitioner in the criminal cases. The continuation of rowdy sheet against the petitioner is not in violation of right of privacy and other fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution of India.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the last case against the petitioner was closed in the year 2013. The same is not disputed by the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home.

6. As all the five cases wherein the petitioner was involved ended in acquittal/compromise, the continuation of rowdy sheet even after nine years is totally unjustified. It is not the case of the respondent police that the petitioner was involved in other criminal cases in the past nine years. Moreover, as there is no case pending against the petitioner, it would be arbitrary on the part of the respondent police to continue the rowdy sheet against the petitioner.

Hence, the writ petition is allowed and the respondents are directed to close the rowdy sheet opened against the petitioner.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

There shall be no order as to costs.

SD/- T. SRINIVAS
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary (Home), State of Telangana, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Sangareddy District.
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sangareddy Division, Sanga Reddy District.
4. The Station House Officer, Sangareddy Town, Sangareddy District.
5. One CC to SRI KATIKA RAVINDER REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
6. Two CCs to GP for Home, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
7. Two CD Copies.
8. One Spare Copy

MP
GJP



HIGH COURT

DATED:10/10/2022



ORDER

WP.No.35118 of 2022

**DISPOSING OF THE WRIT PETITION
WITHOUT COSTS**

10
MA
14/10/22