

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.587 of 2026

02.02.2026

Between:

Amith Raj Sinha.

PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Through Public Prosecutor
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad.

RESPONDENT

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.2 in Crime No.184/2025 before the BDL Bhanoor Police Station, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 105, 110, 118(1) and 118(2) of BNS.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 30.06.2025 at about 11:40 hours, the complainant Sri Rajanala Sai Yashwanth, lodged a petition before P.S. BDL Bhanoor stating that his father, Sri Rajanala Venkat Jagan Mohan, aged 55 years, who had been working in Sigachi Company at Pashamallaram village for the last 20 years, died in a fire accident that occurred in the said company on 30.06.2025 at about 09:30 hours. It was alleged that despite repeated requests by the employees to replace the old and unsafe machinery, the management continued to operate the same, resulting in an explosion and fire accident in which nine employees died on the spot, including the complainant's father, and several others sustained grievous burn injuries. Subsequently, more employees succumbed to injuries during treatment, and in total 13 deaths and 30–35 serious injuries were reported. On the basis of the said complaint, Crime No.184/2025 was registered .

3. Heard Sri S.Niranjan Reddy, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Smt Rubaina Khatoon, learned counsel for petitioner, and Sri Palle Nageshwar Rao, learned

Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner/Accused No.2, who is the Managing Director and CEO of the company, has been falsely implicated in the present case solely by virtue of his designation, without any specific overt act or proximate conduct being attributed to him. He contended that even if the allegations in the FIR and complaint are taken at their face value, they do not disclose the essential ingredients of culpable homicide not amounting to murder under Section 105 BNS, nor of attempt under Section 110 BNS, nor of voluntarily causing grievous hurt. He lamented that the incident, though unfortunate, at best discloses regulatory lapses or negligence, which cannot be elevated to the threshold of culpable knowledge required under law. He averred that the petitioner has cooperated with the investigation at all stages, has deep roots in society, and there is no apprehension of abscondence or tampering with evidence. Therefore, prayed this Court to allow this criminal petition, granting the relief of bail to petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner stating that pursuant to the complaint lodged on 30.06.2025 regarding the tragic fire accident in M/s Sigachi Industries Pvt. Ltd., Crime No.184/2025 was registered and subsequently altered to Sections 105, 110, 118(1) and 118(2) of BNS, in view of the gravity of the incident which resulted in the death of 54 workers and grievous injuries to 28 others. He averred that inspection reports of the Deputy Chief Inspector of Factories and the findings of the five-member expert committee categorically established that the management, including the Petitioner/A-2, had full knowledge of the risks associated with MCC dust and hazardous machinery yet deliberately ignored mandatory safety protocols, employed untrained workers, failed to provide firefighting equipment and protective measures, and prioritized production targets over worker safety, thereby, exhibiting gross negligence and callous disregard for human life. He asserted that 334 witnesses have been examined who consistently deposed against the accused, and since investigation is at a crucial stage, if regular bail is granted to

the Petitioner/A-2 there exists a serious threat of influencing victims and witnesses, and such relief would send a wrong signal to society that wealthy industrialists can compromise worker safety for profits. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. Having regard to rival submissions made, and on going through the material placed on record, it is noted that petitioner is in jail from 27.12.2025. The allegations leveled against petitioner are that he along with other accused had not taken proper care even after being informed by employees regarding issues in machines which were required to be changed, whereas, the report would show that fire was initiated in sealing machines, but it is not mentioned that sealing machines became old and there are defects due to which the fire accident occurred. That apart, it is noticed that charge sheet in the case is already filed. Though learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the Deputy Chief Inspector of Factories inspected and reported lapses on the part of Directors, it is pertinent to note that separate case is filed by the concerned authorities under the Factories Act.

7. Considering the fact that the investigation is already completed and charge sheet is filed, including the fact that petitioner is cooperating with the investigation, this Court is of the opinion that custodial interrogation of petitioner is not required. That being so, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to following the below conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Sangareddy District.
- ii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 480(3) of the BNSS, earlier known as Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C.
- iii. The petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or attempt to influence witnesses in any manner.
- iv. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is

at liberty to file petition for
cancellation of bail.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall
stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 02.02.2026
PT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.587 of 2026

Date: 02.02.2026

PT