

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.5749 AND 5863 OF 2026

DATE : 01.05.2026

CRL.P.NO.5749 OF 2026 :

Between :

S.M.Kaleemulla

... Petitioner/A.1

And

The State of Telangana

... Respondent/Complainant

CRL.P.NO.5863 OF 2026 :

Between :

Parveen Begum

... Petitioner/A.4

And

The State of Telangana

... Respondent/Complainant

: COMMON ORDER :

These Criminal Petitions are filed praying this Court to
enlarge the petitioners on bail who are arrayed as accused No.1

and 4 respectively in Crime No.22 of 2026 of Bijinapally Police Station, Nagarkurnool District. Initially the offences alleged against the petitioners are under Sections 109(1) r/w.3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and thereafter it was altered to Section 103(1) r/w.3(5) of BNS.

2. The facts of the case are that on 29.01.2026 at about 7:30 PM, the complainant, Md. Raheemunnisa Begum, lodged a complaint before police stating that on the same day at about 3:00 PM, her husband informed her that he was going to their agricultural field at Karkonda Village and left the house. Later, at about 5:00 PM, she came to know that while her husband was working in the field, due to an old agricultural land dispute, the accused persons namely Md. Khaleemulla and Md. Khaleelulla went there, picked up a quarrel with him, pushed him to the ground, and while Khaleelulla caught hold of both his hands, Khaleemulla attacked him with an axe on his face and head with an intention to kill him, causing severe bleeding injuries. On hearing the incident, villagers namely Udala Balaraju, Neelaiah and Gudise Thirupathaaiah came there and shifted the injured Fayaz to the Government Hospital at Nagarkurnool for treatment. She further stated that the accused, due to the previous land dispute, intentionally

conspired and attacked her husband with an axe and requested to take necessary action against the accused basing on which, police registered the present crime against the accused.

3. Heard Sri N.Bhavani Shankar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in both the criminal petitions and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case due to previous village and agricultural land disputes and have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is submitted that the allegations in the complaint mainly attribute the overt acts to Accused Nos.1 and 2, namely that A-2 caught hold of the deceased while A-1 allegedly attacked him with an axe, and there are no specific allegations regarding the presence, participation, instigation, or overt acts against A.4 whose name does not find mention in the FIR. It is further contended that the implication of A.4 during the course of investigation is only an afterthought and amounts to mechanical roping in the case without any basis. Learned counsel also submitted that A.2, 3 and 4 have already been

enlarged on bail and therefore the present petitioners are entitled to similar relief on the ground of parity. It is further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary, as the investigation is substantially complete. He further contended that A.1 is in jail from 30.01.2026 and A.4 is in jail from 13.04.2026. It is also contended that the earlier criminal case involving the deceased and the longstanding hostility between the parties are relevant surrounding circumstances to show prior enmity and the possibility of false implication in the present case. Petitioners undertake to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioners by allowing these criminal petitions.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that A.1 to A.4 hatched a plan to kill the deceased, further though there is no mention of the name of A.4 in the complaint, basing on the statement of deceased, A.4 was added as accused and that there are specific allegations against her. Further as the offence committed by the petitioners is serious in nature, they are not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss these petitions.

6. Considering the submissions made by both counsel and the material on record, it is seen that A.1 is in jail from 30.01.2026 and A.4 is in jail from 13.04.2026 and charge sheet is not filed till today. Most of the investigation is completed including recording the statement of the investigating authority. Hence, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioners shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) each with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the II Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Nagarkurnool, Nagarkurnool District.
- ii. The petitioners 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 petitioners shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, both the Criminal Petitions are allowed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :01.05.2026
Rds

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.5749 AND 5863 OF 2026

DATE :01.05.2026

Rds