IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.15662 OF 2026

(CNR No. HBHC010657672026)

DATE: 05.10.2026

Between :

Gaddam Vamshi Krishna and others.

... Petitioners

AND

The State of Telangana.

... Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* (for short, 'BNSS'), seeking the relief of pre-arrest bail.

2. The petitioners are arrayed as the accused Nos.1 to 7 in Crime No.846 of 2026 on the file of the Dundigal Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, facing accusations under Sections 85, 109 of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (for short 'BNS') and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Heard Mr. Mahesh Muddala, learned Counsel for the petitioners, and Mr.Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent-State.

4.1. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the de facto complainant was married to Accused No.1 on 20.02.2025. At the time of the marriage, gold articles and agricultural properties were allegedly presented as dowry, and the marriage was celebrated on a grand scale. It is alleged that, after about three months of the marriage, the petitioners herein/accused subjected the de facto complainant to physical and mental harassment, demanding an additional dowry of Rs.15 lakhs. Owing to the alleged unbearable harassment, her parents are stated to have transferred an amount of Rs.11 lakhs.

4.2. It is further alleged that Accused No.5, the sister-in-law of the de facto complainant, frequently visited the matrimonial home and provoked Petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 by stating that the dowry brought by the de facto complainant was insufficient and that a further amount of dowry ought to be demanded. The other family members are also alleged to have subjected the de facto complainant to mental harassment by repeatedly stating that she had brought only a meager amount of dowry. It is alleged that the accused demanded payment of the dowry amount brought by her and amounts taken from her sisters, and threatened that, unless such amounts were paid, she would not be accepted as a member of the family. It is further alleged that Accused No.1, acting upon such instigation, along with the other accused, subjected her to harassment. The matter was also placed before the elders in April 2026; however,

according to the prosecution, there was no change in the attitude of the accused.

4.3. It is further alleged that, in an occurrence during the year 2025, when the father of the de facto complainant was hospitalized, the petitioners insisted that she bring additional dowry. When she refused to comply with the demand, all the accused allegedly forcibly made her swallow 40 tablets, as a result of which her health condition became critical. It is alleged that the accused themselves took her to the hospital and threatened her that, if she disclosed the incident to anyone, they would kill her and her family members.

4.4. It is further alleged that the de facto complainant was compelled to resign from her employment in July 2025 and that her husband had availed certain loans on the basis of her salary. After the demise of her father, the accused allegedly intensified the harassment and, on 01.08.2026, made her leave the matrimonial home, stating that she would not be taken back unless she brought additional dowry. Consequently, she is stated to have gone to the house of her paternal uncle. Based on the report lodged by her, the present case came to be registered.

5.1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the case. It is

further contended that the allegations contained in the complaint are omnibus in nature and that no specific overt acts have been attributed to the individual petitioners. According to learned counsel, continuation of the proceedings against the petitioners, in the absence of specific allegations against them, would therefore be improper.

5.2. Learned counsel further submits that the alleged incident involving the administration of tablets and contends that the allegation is bereft of material particulars. It is further submitted that, admittedly, the petitioners themselves took the de facto complainant to the hospital, which, according to learned counsel, is a circumstance inconsistent with an intention to (cause her death). It is also contended that the other offences alleged against the petitioners are punishable with imprisonment of less than seven years. Further, having regard to the medical condition of Petitioner No.1, the advanced age of Petitioner Nos.2 to 4, and the petitioners' willingness to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions that may be imposed, learned counsel seeks grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition and submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioners with regard to their involvement in the alleged harassment of the de facto complainant and, in particular, in the incident wherein the petitioners are alleged to have administered tablets with a view to do away with her

life. It is further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and that the presence of the petitioners may be required for the purpose of conducting the investigation effectively. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor contends that, if anticipatory bail is granted at this stage, there is a possibility that the petitioners may not cooperate with the investigation. He therefore prays for dismissal of the petition.

7. I have carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the materials on record.

8. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioners is that they subjected the de facto complainant to physical and mental harassment for additional dowry and, on one occasion, allegedly attempted to cause her death by forcibly administering tablets. The latter allegation attracts consideration under Section 109 of the BNS, subject to proof of the requisite intention or knowledge and other ingredients of the provision.

9. At the stage of considering anticipatory bail, the Court is not required to undertake a meticulous examination of the evidence or record definitive findings on the truthfulness of the allegations. The Court is required to make a prima facie assessment having regard to the nature and gravity of the accusation, the role attributed to each accused, the necessity for custodial interrogation, the possibility of fleeing from justice

or interfering with the investigation, and the likelihood of compliance with the conditions imposed.

10. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565, the Constitution Bench held that there can be no inflexible formula for granting anticipatory bail and that the Court must consider the cumulative effect of the relevant circumstances, including the nature and seriousness of the accusation, securing the presence of the accused, the possibility of tampering with witnesses, and the interests of justice. The Constitution Bench in *Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, likewise affirmed that anticipatory bail is not governed by an inflexible approach and that appropriate conditions may be imposed having regard to the facts of each case.

11. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioners, prima facie, general in nature, whereas allegations of harassment are made against Petitioner No.1. Though the complaint names the accused and attributes acts of instigation and participation in relation to the allegations of abetment, the ultimate truth of those allegations and whether the individual acts satisfy the ingredients of the offences are matters for investigation and, if necessary, trial.

12. It is also relevant that the petitioners themselves took the de facto complainant to the hospital following the alleged tablet-administration

incident. While this circumstance does not determine the merits of the accusation, it is relevant in assessing the necessity for custodial interrogation. The seriousness of the allegation of an attempt on her life cannot be overlooked, but it must be considered along with the surrounding circumstances and the actual requirement of custodial interrogation.

13. The petitioners have expressed their willingness to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed. In the circumstances, and in the absence of any convincing material demonstrating that custodial interrogation is indispensable for a fair and effective investigation, the mere pendency of investigation cannot constitute sufficient ground to deny anticipatory bail. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits or truthfulness of the allegations, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners' prayer for anticipatory bail can be considered favourably, subject to appropriate conditions to secure their cooperation with the investigation and safeguard the interests of the prosecution.

14. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to following conditions.

(A) The petitioners/accused shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Dundigal Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, on or

before 21.10.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release them on bail on execution of 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 said officer.

(B) The petitioners shall appear before the Investigating officer on every Tuesday and Wednesday between 10.00AM to 03.00PM, for a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of their release on bail or until the filing of the final result, whichever is earlier.

(C) The petitioners shall remain available for investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate fully with the investigation.

(D) The petitioners shall furnish their complete residential address and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the course of investigation.

(E) The petitioners shall not either directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or contact any prosecution witness, nor shall they tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(F) The petitioners shall strictly comply with all the conditions contemplated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(G) Any wilful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioners liable to appropriate proceedings before the court below, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable law.

15. It is made clear that any observations made herein are confined solely to the adjudication of the present application for anticipatory bail and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

_____

N.TUKARAMJI, J

Date: 05.10.2026
mmr

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.15662 OF 2026

DATE: 05.10.2026

mmr