

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.2298 & 2375 of 2026

DATE: 03.03.2026

Crl.P.No.2298 of 2026

BETWEEN:

Godisela Rajaramesh @ Godisela Raja Ramesh Babu and another

.....Petitioners/accused Nos.3 and 6

And

The State of Telangana,

Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,

High Court for the State of Telangana

at Hyderabad.

.....Respondent/complainant

Crl.P.No.2375 of 2026

BETWEEN:

Gajula Chandra Kiran and two others

.....petitioners/accused Nos.5, 7 and 9

And

The State of Telangana,

Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,

High Court for the State of Telangana

at Hyderabad.

.....Respondent/complainant

: COMMON ORDER :

These Criminal Petitions are filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, who are arrayed as accused Nos.3, 5, 7, 6 and 9 in Crime No.40 of 2026 before the Ramakrishnapur Police Station, Ramagundam District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 189(3), 191(2), 191(3), 121(2), 223 of BNS read with 190 of BNSS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the case arose out of an incident dated 17.02.2026 at Kyathanpalli Flyover during bandobast duty in connection with the municipal swearing-in ceremony. He stated that the allegations were that certain political activists, including the petitioners, had argued with the police when their vehicles were stopped and that stones were allegedly pelted, resulting in injuries to police personnel. He further submitted that some of the accused had already been arrested and remanded, while the present petitioners sought anticipatory bail apprehending arrest.

3. Heard Sri T.V. Ramana Rao, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners as well as Sri M. Ramachandra

Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners were falsely implicated due to political rivalry and that they had not committed any overt acts as alleged in the complaint. He further submitted that the ingredients of the serious offences invoked were not made out against the petitioners and that the allegations were exaggerated. He contended that the petitioners were law-abiding citizens and there is no necessity for custodial interrogation. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners by allowing these Criminal Petitions.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners had actively participated in the unlawful assembly, obstructed police personnel from discharging their official duties, and pelted stones, causing grievous injuries to police officers, including one who is undergoing treatment. He contended that the offences invoked are serious in nature, that the investigation is in progress, and that custodial interrogation is necessary.

Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss these criminal petitions.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the main allegation against the petitioners is that they were members of an unlawful assembly, obstructed police personnel while they were discharging their official duties during bandobast, and pelted stones, thereby causing injuries to the police officials. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that petitioner No.2/A.6 in CrI.P.No.2298 of 2026 and petitioner No.3/A.9 in CrI.P.No.2375 of 2026 have been arrested by the police. In view of the said development, the relief sought in the present Criminal Petitions, in so far as A.6 and A.9 is concerned, does not survive for consideration.

7. Insofar as petitioner No.1/A.3 in CrI.P.No.2298 of 2026 and petitioner Nos.1 and 2/A.5 and A.7 in CrI.P.No.2375 of 2026 are concerned, it is brought to the notice of this Court that the trial Court has already granted regular bail to A.1, A.2, A.4 and A.8 in this crime vide CrI.M.P.No.77 of 2026

dated 02.03.2026. Having regard to the nature of allegations and considering the fact that similarly placed co-accused have been enlarged on bail, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the same benefit to A.3, A.5 and A.7 as well, subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioners/A.3, A.5 and A.7 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Ramakrishnapur Police Station, Ramagundam District within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioner No.1/A.3 on bail on his executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioners/A.3, A.5 and A.7 shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 05.00 p.m., on every Monday 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.3, A.5 and A.7 shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482 (2) of BNSS and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

8. Accordingly, Criminal Petition No.2298 of 2026 is allowed insofar as petitioner No.1/A.3 is concerned and is dismissed as infructuous insofar as petitioner No.2/A.6 is concerned. Criminal Petition No.2375 of 2026 is allowed insofar as petitioner Nos.1 and 2/A.5 and A.7 are concerned and is dismissed as infructuous insofar as petitioner No.3/A.9 is concerned.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 03.03.2026
SAI/Rds

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.2298 & 2375 of 2026

Date: 03.03.2026

SAI/Rds