

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.5167 OF 2026

DATE : 21.04.2026

BETWEEN:

Janagama Chandra Shaker @ Chandra Shekar Reddy

.....Petitioner/Accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court Building, 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 in Crime No.114 of 2026 of Pargi Police Station, Vikarabad District. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 105 and 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS').

2. The facts of the case are that on 21.03.2026 at about 21:00 hours, a complaint was received from the complainant stating that his son, Mudavath Suresh had left home on

19/20.03.2026 at about 08:00 hours to go to Parigi for daily wage labour work, but did not return home thereafter. The complainant stated that although the deceased occasionally stayed away for 2 to 3 days, on 21.03.2026 photographs of his son's dead body were received in the family WhatsApp group along with information that the body was found in a maize field beside the Parigi to Vikarabad Road. On seeing the photographs, the family identified the deceased and immediately went to the Government Hospital, Parigi, where they found the dead body in the mortuary. The complainant observed electric shock burn injuries on the right palm, peeled skin on the left wrist, slight decomposition and foul smell, indicating that the death had occurred about two days earlier. On enquiry, it was learnt that the agricultural land where the body was found belonged to the petitioner resident of Parigi village, who had allegedly erected electric fencing around his field and connected it to live current without taking precautionary measures such as warning boards or safety safeguards. It is alleged that the deceased might have entered the open land to attend nature's call or for some other purpose, came into contact with the live fence, sustained electric shock and died on the spot. Therefore, the complainant alleged that the death of his son was caused

due to the negligence of the petitioner and requested to take necessary legal action.

3. Heard Sri G. Mallesha, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the allegations made against the petitioner are false, baseless and exaggerated. It is submitted that the petitioner is a farmer by occupation and had erected a GI wire fencing of about 2 feet height around his drumstick crop field, connected to the electric line passing through the land, only for the purpose of protecting the crop from damage caused by wild boars, which is a recurring problem in the area. The petitioner denied causing the death of deceased or having any intention to cause harm to any person. It is further submitted that the facts of the case do not attract the offence of murder under Section 103 of B.N.S and at the most may fall under Section 105 thereof, as there was no intention to cause death and the act was done only to safeguard agricultural crops. It is also contended that the investigation is substantially completed, as the Investigating Officer has already arrested the petitioner, conducted necessary panchanamas,

seized the material objects including the GI wire and cable wire, examined witnesses, conducted inquest and post-mortem examination, and recorded the statements of all relevant witnesses. Therefore, there is no possibility of the petitioner tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, and no further recovery remains to be made from him. He further submitted that the petitioner is the sole breadwinner of his family, and his continued incarceration is causing severe hardship to his family, livelihood and agricultural activities. Hence, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that due to erection of electric wire fencing, the deceased got electrocution and died. The petitioner did not take any precautions in fencing his land. Hence, petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by both the counsel and the material on record, the petitioner herein fenced his farm with electric wire and the deceased got contacted with the same and died due to electrocution and thereafter the petitioner screened the offence and shifted the dead body to another place. Considering the allegations against the petitioner and also

progress in investigation that Lws.1 to 14 are examined, this Court deems it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioner 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 Judicial First Class Magistrate at Parigi.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Monday 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 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date :21.04.2026
Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.5167 OF 2026

DATE : 21.04.2026

Rds