

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16033 OF 2025

23.12.2025

Between :

Madanakanti Sravan & two others

... Petitioners/Accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by its Public Prosecutor
High Court for the State of Telangana,
Hyderabad & another

... Respondents

:ORDER:

This criminal petition is filed under section 528 r/w.483 (2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to quash the order dated 26.11.2025 passed in CrI.M.P.No.194 of 2025 in Spl.S.C.No.4 of 2018 on the file of Special Judge for Trial of Cases under SCs/STs (POA) Act-cum-II-Additional Sessions Judge, Nizamabad. CrI.M.P.No.194 of 2025 is filed under Section 432(2) of Cr.P.C, by the defacto complainant to cancel the bail granted to accused Nos.1 to 3.

2. The facts of the case are that the 2nd respondent and 1st petitioner/A.1 got married on 31.05.2015 at Kamareddy. The 2nd respondent belonged to the Scheduled Caste (SC) community and at the time of marriage, her parents gave Rs.8 lakhs in cash, three tulas of gold and household items worth Rs.1 lakh as dowry. It was further alleged that the accused harassed the 2nd respondent, demanding Rs.10 lakhs as additional dowry and on 04.01.2017, A.1 allegedly necked out the 2nd respondent out of the house and insulted her based on her caste. The 2nd respondent had filed DVC Case No. 6 of 2021 before the Junior Civil Judge, Kamareddy, and the Court passed orders in her favor against the petitioner No.1, who is Accused No.1 in that case. The 2nd respondent also filed an execution petition, Crl.M.P.No.545 of 2024, against A.1 to recover the DVC amount of Rs.6,45,000/-, M.C. No. 21 of 2017 and Crl.M.P. No.378 of 2025 towards maintenance amount of Rs.7,76,000/- as ordered by the Court. A.1 had paid only a meager amount of Rs.50,000/- in installments and requested the Court to allow settlement talks with the 2nd respondent on 18.07.2025. The 2nd respondent alleged that during the settlement talks, A.1 openly admitted that he had already married another woman and had two children from that second

marriage. When the 2nd respondent questioned him about committing illegal act without obtaining a legal divorce, A.1 allegedly assaulted her and hurled caste-based abuses. The relatives of A.1 who accompanied him for the talks, also allegedly abused the 2nd respondent using caste-related slurs. As a result, she lodged a complaint at Kamareddy Police Station and a case was registered in Crime No. 368 of 2025, under Sections 292, 352, 115(2), 351(2) r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 2015.

3. Heard Sri C.Sharan Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Palle Sriharinath, learned counsel for the 2nd respondent.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 2nd respondent alleged an incident on 18.07.2025 during compromise talks at the Junior Civil Judge Court, Kamareddy, where A.1 allegedly abused her using caste-based remarks. Based on this, Crime No. 368 of 2025 was registered under various sections of the BNS and SC/ST (POA) Act. However, the petitioners claimed no such incident occurred and that CCTV footage would prove the allegations false. They also contended

that A.2 and A.3 were not named in the FIR and were only issued notices under Section 41-A Cr.P.C., but not granted bail. The trial court failed to consider this and did not cite any bail condition violations by A.1. He also submitted that even if the incident occurred, it was an isolated incident occurred eight years after registration of crime and it is not a ground for cancellation of bail. Hence, they sought to quash the impugned order.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for 2nd respondent filed a counter, stating that the petition to quash the bail cancellation order lacks merit and is not maintainable, as a statutory remedy is available. The 2nd respondent had filed a complaint on 04.01.2017, stating that her marriage with A.1 was a love marriage. Later, A.1 and his family allegedly harassed her for an additional dowry of Rs.10 lakhs, despite her parents already giving Rs.8 lakhs, a Royal Enfield motorcycle, and household items. Initially, she lived happily, but later her husband, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sister-in-law, and her husband allegedly forced her out of the house and abused her using caste-based slurs. A case was registered in Crime No. 3 of 2017 under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC, Section 4 of the Dowry

Prohibition Act, and Sections 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (POA) Act. A.1 was granted regular bail on 20.04.2017. After investigation, a charge sheet was filed against A.1 and his parents, while the others were exonerated. The case is currently at the stage of cross-examination of PW.1. It is further stated 2nd respondent also filed a DVC, an execution petition for recovery of the DVC amount, M.C. No. 21 of 2017, and CrI.M.P. No. 378 of 2025 for maintenance. However, A.1 paid only Rs.50,000/- and requested to settle the matter through talks on 18.07.2025. During the discussion, A.1 allegedly abused the 2nd respondent using caste-based slurs and physically assaulted her by slapping her face and hitting her head inside the court hall. This act violated the conditions of bail, and the trial court rightly cancelled the bail. The claim of the accused that no such incident occurred and that CCTV footage would prove it false was denied, as there was no CCTV camera at the place of incident. The incident reportedly occurred in the presence of both parties' counsels. Therefore, the 2nd respondent claimed that the petitioners are not entitled for bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by both the counsel and the material on record the contention of petitioners is that the trial Court erroneously concluded that as there is an attack in the Court itself, the bail granted to petitioners has to be cancelled. As seen from the order, whatever the allegations made are against A.1 only, there are no such allegations against A.2 and A.3 and they are also not shown as accused in Cr.No.368 of 2025 registered in Kamareddy Police Station. Further A.2 and A.3 were not granted bail and that they were served with Section 41-A Cr.P.C, notice. Further on the allegation of attack by A.1, a crime was already registered against him which is not a ground to cancel the bail granted to him. A.1 was granted bail on 20.04.2017 and there is no allegation that he has violated the conditions of bail granted by the Court. Therefore, there are no grounds to cancel the bail granted to the petitioners. As such, the order of the trial Court is liable to be set aside.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed setting aside the order dated 26.11.2025 passed in CrI.M.P.No.194 of 2025 in Spl.S.C.No.4 of 2018 on the file of Special Judge for Trial of

Cases under SCs/STs (POA) Act-cum-II-Additional Sessions
Judge, Nizamabad.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand
closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :23.12.2025
Rds

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16033 OF 2025

DATE :23.12.2025

Rds