

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12829 of 2025

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed seeking to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent/accused No.4 vide order dated 25.09.2025 passed in CrI.P.No.12477 of 2025.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the complaint lodged by one Sri Venkateswarlu Mudigondla, father of the deceased, alleging that his daughter, Poola Laxmi Prasanna, was subjected to continuous harassment by her husband/accused No.1, mother-in-law/accused No.3 and other family members including accused No.4, for additional dowry. Despite repeated panchayats, the harassment continued. The deceased was kept under surveillance, isolated, and denied medical treatment. On 23.08.2025, she was found with multiple injuries and burn marks and later died while undergoing treatment at KIMS Hospital, Rajahmundry. Based on the evidence and confessional statements of A-1 to A-3, the case was altered to Sections 85 and 103 read with 3(5) of the

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Heard Sri P. Nageswara Rao, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri K. Rajashekar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the Respondent/accused No.4 played a crucial role in the commission of the offence, as the entire incident occurred in his house and under his directions. He absconded after registration of the case and took away the DVR containing CCTV footage, which is vital evidence. His custodial interrogation was necessary for recovery of the same. The respondent, being financially strong and having children abroad, had every possibility of absconding. The case involved the brutal death of a young married woman due to dowry harassment, which created public outrage. Therefore, he prayed the Court to cancel the bail granted to the respondent by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent/accused submitted that all the allegations made against the respondent are false and baseless and that the

deceased was suffering from anemia even prior to the incident and her health condition deteriorated due to the same. The respondent has no connection whatsoever with the alleged offence. It is further submitted that there are no grounds to cancel the anticipatory bail granted by this Court. The respondent voluntarily appeared before the Police to furnish sureties in compliance with the bail order; however, the concerned Police authorities refused to accept the sureties, in disobedience to the orders of this Court, which clearly indicates their intention to take the respondent into custody despite the bail order. It is further contended that immediately after the incident, the Police had taken the respondent into custody, and the same was reported in the newspapers, which belies the allegation that he was absconding. It is also submitted that the DVR containing the CCTV footage has already been seized by the Investigating Officer, and hence, the allegation that the respondent concealed or destroyed evidence is incorrect. Therefore, he prayed that the petition seeking cancellation of bail be dismissed.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and on perusal of the material available on

record, it appears that the principal ground urged by the prosecution for cancellation of bail is that the respondent/accused No.4 was present at the scene of offence and had actively participated in the harassment of the deceased. The prosecution mainly relied upon the statement of the minor daughter of the deceased, who is studying in 4th class, stating that her father (accused No.1) hit her mother on the head, causing her to fall unconscious, and thereafter, her father and the respondent took her to the hospital. Her statement also discloses that all the accused, including the respondent, used to beat the deceased. However, even as per her version, on the date of the incident, it was her father (A-1) who assaulted her mother.

7. Learned Public Prosecutor, on instructions, submitted that the said child witness (L.W.7) is presently residing with her paternal grandmother, whereas it is the contention of the respondent that the child is presently living with him, thereby creating a factual dispute that cannot be adjudicated at this stage. There is no material placed before this Court showing that the respondent has violated any of the conditions imposed while granting anticipatory bail. The only

apprehension of the prosecution that the respondent may abscond appears to be speculative in nature. Hence, this Court does not find any ground to cancel the anticipatory bail already granted to the respondent. However, in order to ensure his continued availability for investigation and trial, the respondent is directed to deposit his passport before the concerned Court within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. With the above direction, this Criminal Petition is disposed of.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 25.10.2025
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12829 of 2025

Date: 25.10.2025

sai