

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.750 of 2026

DATE: 06.02.2026

BETWEEN:

B.Veeranna @ Gabbari Veeranna

.....Petitioner/A.3

And

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

.....Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.3 in Crime No.169 of 2025 of Dharoor (M) Police Station at Jogulamba Gadwal, registered for the offences

punishable under Sections 103 (1), 238, 61 (2) (a), 49, 249 r/w.3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 22.11.2025 at about 06:00 hours, the complainant lodged a complaint stating that on 21.11.2025 at about 10:20 hours, his younger brother, Boya Chinna Bheema Raidu, left home on his Unicorn bike for personal work. At about 4:40 p.m. on the same day, the complainant received a phone call from a villager, Moulali, informing him that his brother had died in a road accident near Jampally Bus Stop on the Gadwal–Raichur road. It was reported that a Bolero vehicle bearing No. AP 39 W 3068, driven rashly, hit the bike from behind, causing the death of the complainant's brother on the spot. The complainant and his family rushed to the scene and found the bike dragged for about 200 meters and the body lying far away, indicating that no brakes were applied. Locals informed them that the Bolero driver fled from the spot. Based on past disputes, the complainant suspected Millu Veeranna, Surendher, Gabbari Veeranna, Mahadev, Pawan, Shankarappa, JCB Veeranna, and Veeresh of the same village for the death of his brother. Accordingly, he requested the

police to take action, and a case was registered against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri Bollu Nagaraju, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the entire allegations against the petitioner is totally false and invented for the purpose of this crime. Petitioner never involved in this crime as alleged. The petitioner herein is implicated in this case basing on the confession of other accused. Petitioner is in jail from 27.11.2025 and most of the investigation is completed except filing of charge sheet and petitioner undertakes to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. He further contended that the wife of petitioner is suffering with respiratory diseases, as such, the presence of the petitioner is very much necessary with her. Hence, prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor filed a counter opposing bail stating that A.1 to A.3 conspired to murder the deceased by hiring other accused for Rs.25 lakhs, providing them with a Bolero vehicle and untraceable mobile phones. There was a long-standing dispute between A.1 and the deceased. A.1 owned a rice mill, while the deceased was a former Sarpanch, and their houses were situated opposite to each other. The deceased had earlier complained against A.1 to the civil supplies authorities, resulting in a fine of Rs.7.5 crores against A.1. Due to this, A.1 allegedly bore a grudge and, along with others, planned the murder. The petitioner was alleged to be the main conspirator who, due to his close association with the deceased, provided information about the deceased's movements and routine and also contributed financially, as he had a land dispute with the deceased. Hence, if the petitioner is granted bail he may not cooperate with the investigation and may tamper the evidence and threaten the witnesses. Hence, petitioner is not entitled for bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. In view of the submissions made by both counsels and the material available on record, it is seen that the petitioner

is in jail from 27.11.2025 and Lws.1 to 21 are examined. Considering the period of incarceration of petitioner in jail, the progress in investigation and in view of the health grounds of the wife of the petitioner, this Court deems it fit to grant regular bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioner/A.3 shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Jogulamba District.
- ii. The petitioner/A.3 shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) weeks or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.
- iii. The petitioner/A.3 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 06.02.2026
Rds

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.750 of 2026

DATE :06.02.2026

Rds