

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4484 OF 2026

DATE : 13.04.2026

Between:

P. Varalaxmi

....Petitioner/A.2

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana & another

..... Respondents/
Complainants

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking the Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the event of her arrest in connection with FIR No.686 of 2025 of Jubilee Hills Police Station, Hyderabad. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 118(1), 126(2), 351(2), 309(4) r/w.3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS').

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 09.11.2025 the complainant, Mr. Sunil Kumar Ahuja, lodged a complaint stating that his father is the absolute owner and possessor of property bearing H.No.8-2-293/82/A/321/A/24, admeasuring 764 square yards, situated at Road No. 25, Jubilee Hills, having purchased the same from Mrs. P. Sreedevi under a registered Sale Deed in the year 2009, and that the family has been in possession thereof and regularly paying electricity and municipal bills. He stated that on 09.11.2025 at about 4:00 PM, upon learning that unknown persons had trespassed into the property, he visited the premises along with his friend Imran, where they were confronted by one Mr. Sagar and subsequently wrongfully confined by Mrs. P. Sreedevi, Mrs. P. Varalaxmi, and their associates. It is alleged that the accused threatened him to relinquish his claim over the property and, upon his refusal, assaulted him with iron rods and knives, causing injuries to his head, thighs, buttocks, and wrist, and also snatched away his iPhone and iWatch. The complainant further stated that despite an earlier case already being registered regarding trespass, the accused again unlawfully entered the property, assaulted him, and the entire incident was recorded in cameras and mobile phones. Hence requested the police for taking necessary action

against the accused, basing on which the present case is registered against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri Ravikanth Shinde, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent – State and Sri Md.Nazeeruddin Khan, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner is aged about 80 years and there are no such allegations against the petitioner to constitute the offences as alleged. He further contended that multiple crimes are registered against the defacto complainant and his father and that they have acquired 85 prime immovable properties in and around Hyderabad and also in Pune of Maharashtra. He further contended that on 27.10.2025, A.1 lodged a complaint before police, regarding attack by the defacto complainant and his goons with video footage in pen drive, but the same was closed citing it as the case civil in nature and the complaint of the defacto complainant was taken immediately and registered it as Cr.No.666 of 2025 which shows the conduct of police. Further petitioner is a diabetic patient requiring insulin daily

and that she is ready to cooperate with the investigation, as such, prayed this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand learned counsel for respondent No.2 opposed bail contending that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Though she is an old aged woman, she is the main culprit in this case. She conspired with other accused and provoked them to commit offence and due to her provocation, the other accused beat the defacto complainant. In support of his contention he relied on the judgment of High Court of Punjab and Haryana in **Piara Singh V State of Punjab**¹, wherein the Court dismissed the petition even the accused therein was 95 years old. He also relied on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Pratibha Manchanda and another V State of Haryana and another**² and contended that the offence committed by the petitioner is grave in nature, as such, petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor also opposed bail contending that the petitioner herein is instrumental in

¹ CRM-M-25799-2020(O&M)

² (2023) 8 Supreme Court Cases 181

commission of crime, as such, she is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

7. Considering the submissions made by both sides and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court observes that the petitioner is an aged person of about 80 years and the allegations against her, at this stage, appear to be general in nature, and the specific overt acts of physical assault are attributed mainly to the other accused. Though the learned counsel for respondent No.2 contended that the petitioner is the main conspirator, the role attributed to the petitioner is a matter to be established during the course of investigation and trial. Further, having regard to the advanced age of the petitioner, her medical condition of being diabetic requiring daily insulin, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary at this stage. Hence, this Court deems it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Jubilee Hills Police Station, Hyderabad within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on her executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, for the like sum each.

- ii. The petitioner 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 petitioner 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, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 13.04.2026
Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4484 OF 2026

DATE : 13.04.2026

Rds