

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.466 OF 2026

DATE :03.02.2026

Between :

Dubba Laxmi Prasanna @ Mahankali Laxmi &
Five others

... Petitioners/A.1 to A.6

And

The State of Telangana,
Through S.H.O. P.S. Gajwel,
Rep., by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana.

... Respondent

: ORDER :

This criminal petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioners/A.1 to A.6 seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.14 of 2026 of Gajwel Police Station, Siddipet District. The offences alleged against the petitioners are under

Sections 108 r/w. Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS').

2. The facts of the case are that on 10.01.2026, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that he had two daughters and one son, all married. His son, Dubba Naresh, aged 43 years, was married about five years ago to Smt. Lakshmi Prasanna, a Government Staff Nurse, and they had a four-year-old son. About six months prior to the incident, Lakshmi Prasanna informed the family that she had come to Gajwel on deputation. However, her deputation was later cancelled, and on 11.11.2025, she left for Godavarikhani along with the child without informing Naresh. Subsequently, Naresh and relatives visited Mandamarri and discussed the issue. Naresh gave a written assurance that he would return within 15 days. Later, relatives of Lakshmi Prasanna's father, namely Mohan and Sneha, allegedly pressurized Naresh over phone to agree for mutual divorce. On 27.12.2025 at about 3:30 a.m., Naresh consumed an unknown pesticide at his residence while the complainant was asleep and allegedly live-streamed a video on Facebook stating that he was dying. On receiving information, friends informed the family. Naresh was shifted to

the Government Hospital, Gajwel, and later referred to Vijetha Hospital, Kompally, where he died during treatment. Based on the complaint, the police registered a case against the accused for the alleged offence.

3. Heard Sri K. Ajay Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Sri M.Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners were innocent of the offences alleged. Petitioner No.1 is the wife of the deceased. After the marriage, they lived happily for about six months, after which the deceased developed bad habits, became addicted to alcohol, remained unemployed, and neglected family responsibilities. Petitioner No.1 was working as a Nursing Officer at GGH, Ramagundam. The deceased allegedly harassed her to secure a transfer to Gajwel and to hand over her salary. Subsequently, petitioner No.1 was transferred to Gajwel on deputation and took care of the family. It is further contended that the deceased had borrowed hand loans amounting to Rs.20 lakhs and demanded additional dowry from petitioner No.1 to repay those debts. Due to

administrative reasons, petitioner No.1 was again posted to GGH, Godavarikhani, which was far from Gajwel. Hence, she requested the deceased to shift to Godavarikhani, but he postponed the matter. On 21.12.2025, the deceased went to the house of petitioner No.2, created a nuisance, and assaulted petitioner No.1, following which a panchayat was held. The deceased assured that he would not repeat such acts and would shift to Godavarikhani within 15 days, but he failed to do so. However again, on 27.12.2025, the deceased went to the house of petitioner No.2, created a nuisance, attempted to kill petitioner No.1, threatened to commit suicide, and circulate their intimate videos. Consequently, petitioner No.1 lodged a complaint, which was registered as Crime No.362 of 2025 for offences under Section 85 of the BNS and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. He further contended that the deceased died due to his bad habits and debts, and that the petitioners are no way responsible for his death. Petitioner No.1 never demanded mutual divorce and intended to live with the deceased, but he committed suicide in the meantime. Hence, the petitioners prayed that this Court to grant them anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that in the dying declaration the deceased stated that due to the harassment of petitioners he committed suicide. The investigation is not yet completed and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by both the counsel and the material placed on record, the petitioners herein are A.1 to A.6. A.1 is the wife of deceased. A.2 and A.3 are parents of A.1, A.4 to A.6 are the relatives of A.1. The allegation against the petitioners is that they have abetted the deceased to commit suicide whereas the document dated 21.12.2025 filed by the petitioners show that the deceased gave an undertaking that he will look after petitioner No.1 well in future. Further the dying declaration filed by the prosecution shows that there is no such allegation against the petitioners, except narrating the incident of what was happened before committing his suicide. Prima-facie there is no such allegation showing that these petitioners instigated the deceased to commit suicide. Hence, this Court deems it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioners/A.1 to A.6 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Gajwel Police Station, Siddipet District within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioners on bail on their executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) each with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioners/A.1 to A.6 shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 05.00 p.m., on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) weeks, for the purpose of investigation or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier and thereafter, as and when required.
- iii. The petitioners/A.1 to A.6 shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482 (2) of BNSS and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date :03.02.2026
Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.466 OF 2026

DATE :03.02.2026

Rds