

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8690 of 2026

DATE: 03.07.2026

BETWEEN:

Mohammed Shakeel Salman.

.....petitioner/accused No.1

And

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

.....Respondents

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to
enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.1

in SC.No.142 of 2026 on the file of the X Additional District and Sessions Judge, at Rajendranagar, RR District, arising out of FIR.No.628 of 2025 before the Rajendranagar Police Station, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 332, 103(1), 303(2), 315, 61(2) r/w 3(5) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the prosecution alleges that on 05.06.2025 at about 17:20 hours, the deceased persons, namely D-1: Shalk Abdullah Abdul Hamid and D-2: Smt. Ummatur Rafai Rizwana, who were senior citizens and husband and wife, were murdered at their residence. It is alleged that the petitioner/A-1 along with A-2 entered the said flat on the pretext of providing massage services and committed the offence. The case was registered in Crime No.628 of 2025 and the petitioner was arrested and subsequently remanded to judicial custody. Thereafter, multiple bail applications were filed and dismissed, and the petitioner is presently in judicial custody since 07.01.2026.

3. Heard Sri SAS. Yousuf, learned counsel for petitioner, Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for respondent No.1 – State, and Sri S.Amjad Syed Yousuf, learned counsel for respondent NO.2.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in prolonged judicial custody and the trial has not commenced. It is contended that the charge sheet has already been filed and continued detention amounts to pre-trial punishment. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, is a resident of Hyderabad, and there is no likelihood of absconding. The allegation of witness tampering is stated to be baseless as no formal complaint or material has been placed on record. Hence, it is prayed that the petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent No.1-State, and learned counsel for respondent No.2, respectively, opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and contended that the petitioner is involved in a grave offence of double murder of senior citizens. It is further contended that earlier bail granted to the petitioner was cancelled by this Court and there is a reasonable apprehension that if released on bail, the petitioner would threaten or influence material witnesses and hamper the trial. Therefore, they prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Having regard to the rival submissions made, and on perusing the material placed on record, it is noted that the petitioner is in jail from 07.01.2026 and it is the specific apprehension of respondent No.2 that if the petitioner is released on bail, he would threaten the material witnesses. However, considering the fact that there is no possibility of completing the trial in the near future, this Court is of the opinion that it is a fit case to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to the compliance of following stringent 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 XI Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Rajendranagar, R.R. District.

ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.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 437(3) of
Cr.P.C. (presently Section 480(3) of the
BNSS).

iv. The petitioner shall not influence or
threaten any witnesses, failing which, the
respondents are at liberty to file a petition
for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand
closed.

Date: 03.07.2026
PT

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8690 of 2026

Date: 03.07.2026

PT