

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

**WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9000 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

Anumula Kavya @ Kavya Sri, D/o. Ramaiah, Age. 46 years, Occ. Household, Caste. Lakkamari Kapu, R/o. H.No.1-76, Neelojipally village of Boinpalli Mandal of Rajanna Sircilla District.

...Petitioner/Accused-A4

AND

The State of Telangana, Through it's Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad.

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition under Section 482 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant Anticipatory Bail, in the event of their arrest release them, to the petitioner/Accused 4 in related to the Crime No. 90 of 2026, on the file of the P.S. Boinpalli, Rajanna Sircilla District, on any terms and conditions as deemed by this Court.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of M/s V.Gopala Rao Amancharla, Advocate for the Petitioner and Sri Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent.

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9000 OF 2026

DATE : 24.06.2026

Between:

Anumula Kavya @ Kavya Sri

...Petitioner-accused No.4.

AND

The State of Telangana.

...Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, "BNSS"), seeking grant of anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner is arrayed as Accused No.4 in Crime No.90 of 2026 on the file of Boinpalli Police Station, Rajanna Sircilla District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 294(b), 329(3) read with 49, 3(5) of *Bhratiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, "BNS").

3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State and perused the material available on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition constitute successive application seeking anticipatory bail. However, it is contended that subsequent to the dismissal of the earlier anticipatory bail applications, the co-accused have been granted regular bail by the jurisdictional Court. According to the learned counsel, such subsequent development warrants reconsideration of the petitioners' request for grant of pre-arrest bail.

5. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that this Court, while dismissing the earlier anticipatory bail application, had extensively considered the allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, and the requirements of investigation. It is therefore contended that no fresh or substantial circumstance has been brought on record to justify reconsideration of the earlier orders.

6. I have carefully considered the submissions.

7. It is not in dispute that the present petition is the successive anticipatory bail application. The sole ground urged by the petitioner as constituting a change in circumstances is the grant of regular bail to Accused Nos.1 to 3.

8. A perusal of the bail orders placed before this Court reveals that the concerned Court granted regular bail to the said accused after taking into consideration factors such as his arrest, the progress made in the investigation, and the completion of substantial

investigative steps insofar as he was concerned. The grant of regular bail in such circumstances cannot automatically confer a right upon the present petitioner to seek anticipatory bail or a ground for reconsideration, particularly when he has not subjected himself to the process of investigation and continue to seek protection against arrest.

9. It is a settled principle that a successive anticipatory bail application is maintainable only upon the existence of a substantial, genuine, and material change in circumstances occurring subsequent to the rejection of the earlier application. Re-agitation of grounds already considered, or reliance upon circumstances that do not materially affect the case against the applicant, cannot furnish a valid basis for reconsideration.

10. In *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan alias Pappu Yadav*, (2004) 7 SCC 528, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that successive bail application may be entertained only when there is a substantial change in the fact situation or legal position necessitating a fresh consideration. Likewise, in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Kajad*, (2001) 7 SCC 673, the Supreme Court emphasized that repeated bail applications in the absence of changed circumstances are impermissible.

11. In the present case, no fresh material, subsequent event, or changed circumstance affecting the merits of the case against the petitioner has been brought to the notice of this Court. The grounds presently urged substantially overlap with those considered and rejected in the earlier orders passed by this Court. Consequently, in the absence of any substantial change in circumstances warranting a fresh consideration, this Court finds no reason to take a view different from the one already taken in the earlier anticipatory bail proceedings.

12. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present Criminal Petition, the same is dismissed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to file regular bail before the trial Court and seek remedy for summoning and availing the benefit of regular bail before the trial Court. In such detention, the trial Court is directed to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law at the earliest, preferably on the very same day.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

**SD/- N.CHANDRA SEKHAR RAO
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Judicial First Class Magistrate At Sircilla.
2. The Station House Officer, Sircilla Town, Police Station, Rajanna Sircilla District.
3. Two CCs to the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
4. One CC to M/s V.Gopala Rao Amancharla, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies

GNK/KA

HIGH COURT

DATED: 24/06/2026



ORDER

CRLP.No.9000 of 2026

DISMISSING THE CRIMINAL PETITION

8/MT
1/7/26