

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.304 of 2026

DATE: 07.04.2026

BETWEEN:

Bijju Raghavendar and another

.....Appellants/accused Nos.6 & 7

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana
through SHO Police Station Shadnagar,
Cyberabad Commissionerate and another.

.....Respondents

ORDER

This Criminal Appeal is filed challenging the order dated 05.03.2026 passed in CrI.M.P.No.286 of 2026 in Crime No.1135 of 2025 by the Special Sessions Judge for Trial of Cases under SCs & STs (POA) Act-cum-VII Additional District & Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar, wherein the bail petition of the appellants/accused No.6 & 7 was dismissed on the ground that the allegations against them are severe/grave in nature.

2. Heard Sri Aitharaju Sameer Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant, Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of

respondent No.1- State and Sri S.M. Rizwan Akhtar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the de facto complainant lodged a report on 13.11.2025 stating that on the night of 12.11.2025, while she and her husband were at their house, one Venkatesh (A-1) of Ellampalli Village, along with three others, came near their house, called her husband outside on the pretext of talking and forcibly took him away in a vehicle without assigning any reason, allegedly due to previous enmity. It was further stated that three days prior to the incident, the brother of the deceased, namely Chandrashekar, had taken away Bhavani, daughter of Venkatesh (A-1) and she suspected that the said incident was connected with the kidnapping. Based on the said report, a case in Crime No.1135 of 2025 was registered for the offences under Section 137(2) read with 3 (5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "BNS"). During the course of investigation, it was revealed that the husband of the de facto complainant was killed by Accused Nos.1 to 4 with the assistance of other accused. The specific allegation against the present appellants/Accused Nos.6 & 7 is that, having knowledge of the intention of Accused Nos.1 to 4 to kill the victim, they showed the house of the victim to them by taking an amount of Rs.10,000/-

(Rupees Ten Thousand only). Accordingly, they were arrayed as Accused Nos.6 & 7 for the offences punishable under Sections 103 (2), 140 (1), 238, 61 (2) read with Section 3 (5) BNS and Section 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015 (for short, "SC/ST (POA) Act).

4. Learned counsel for the appellants contended that the Trial Court dismissed the bail petition solely on the ground that the allegations against the appellants are severe in nature, treating the case as one of the honour killing, whereas the specific allegation against the appellants is only that they showed the house of the victim. It is submitted that there are no allegations that the appellants also wanted to kill the victim. It is further contented that Accused No.7 belongs to Scheduled Caste community and therefore, the provisions of the SC/ST (POA) Act are not attracted against him. It is also submitted that the appellants have been in judicial custody since 17.11.2025, the investigation is complete and the charge sheet has already been filed. Hence, further detention of the appellants is not warranted. Accordingly, prayed this Court to allow the appeal and grant regular bail to the appellants.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 and learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the grant of bail, contending that the appellants are conspirators who, with full knowledge of the intention of Accused Nos.1 to 4 to kill the victim, facilitated the commission of the offence. It is submitted that the brother of the deceased had married the daughter of accused No.1 and therefore, the offence was committed with motive. It is further contended that even if the appellants did not physically participate in the murder, they are equally liable as conspirators, having aided the principal accused. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 relied upon the following judgments in the support of his contentions:

1. ***Vikar Yadav v. State of U.P.*** ¹
2. ***Gudur Sandeep Reddy and others v. State of Telangana***²
3. ***Pratapbhai Hamirbhai Solanki v. State of Gujarat and another.*** ³
4. ***Firozuddin Basheeruddin and others v. State of Kerala***⁴

¹ (2016) 9 SCC 541

² (2021) 1 ALT (Cri) 18

³ (2012) 1 SCC 613

⁴ (2001) 7 SCC 596

6. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is to be noted that the appellants herein are Accused Nos.6 and 7 and the allegation against them is that, upon being informed by Accused Nos.1 to 4 about their intention to kill the victim, they showed the house of the victim and received an amount of Rs.10,000/-. Except these allegations, there is no material to indicate that the appellants shared the intention to commit the murder. It is also not in dispute that the investigation is completed and the charge sheet has been filed. Having regard to the nature of allegations against the appellants, which are distinguishable from those against accused Nos.1 to 4, this Court is of the opinion that the appellants are entitled to be enlarged on bail.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Appeal is allowed, and the appellants/Accused Nos.6 and 7 shall be released on bail forthwith, on each of them executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only) with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned Special Sessions Judge for Trial of Cases under the SCs & STs (POA) Act-cum-VII Additional District & Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar. The appellants shall not contact or

influence the de facto complainant or any prosecution witnesses and shall cooperate with the trial.

8. It is further made clear that during the period of bail, the appellants shall not indulge in any criminal activities. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the respondent-State is at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail.

9. Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 07.04.2026

NOTE: Issue C.C. today.

B/o.

PRN

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.304 of 2026

,

Date: 07.04.2026

NOTE: Issue C.C. today.

B/o.

PRN