IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.16572 AND 16666 OF 2026

DATE: 26.10.2026

Between :

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16572 OF 2026:
(CNR No. HBHC010697572026)

Taneeru Naveen.

… Petitioner/Accused No.3.

AND

The State of Telangana
Represented by Public Prosecutor, High Court of
Telangana at Hyderabad.

… Respondent.

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16666 OF 2026:
(CNR No. HBHC010697602026)

Bayara Priya Singh.

… Petitioner/Accused No.4.

AND

The State of Telangana
Represented by Public Prosecutor, High Court of
Telangana at Hyderabad.

… Respondent.

COMMON ORDER:

Since the issue involved in these petitions are one and the same, they are being disposed of by this common order.

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

3. These petitioners are arrayed as Accused Nos.3 and 4 in FIR No.1071 of 2026 on the file of KPHB police station, Cyberabad Commisionerate for the offences punishable under SectionS109, 118(1) r/w Section 3(5) of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, "BNS").

4. Heard Mr. Raghu Gurram, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for the respondent-State.

5. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant alleged that her younger brother/Accused No. 1 had been quarrelling with her and her younger sister for approximately three years over disputes relating to a house and municipal water supply, in respect of which proceedings were already pending before the competent Courts. It is alleged that, during the said period, Accused

No. 1 had been using the water supply intended for the complainant's house and had been threatening her family members. On 22.08.2026, at about 3:00 p.m., while a water connection was being installed at the complainant's house, Accused No. 1, his wife/Accused No. 2, their son/Accused No. 3 and the wife of Accused No. 3/ Accused No.4 allegedly entered into a quarrel with the complainant's family. When the complainant's father intervened, Accused No. 1 allegedly snatched a spade from Accused No. 2 and struck the victim on the head, causing a bleeding injury and rendering him unconscious. It is further alleged that the accused assaulted the complainant and her family members with the intention of causing their death and inflicted injuries upon them. The injured victim was shifted to the hospital in a critical condition. Based on the report lodged by the de facto complainant, a crime was registered and the investigation was taken up.

6.1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case on account of longstanding family and property disputes. It is contended that the specific allegation of inflicting the head injury with a spade is directed against Accused No. 1 and that no such overt act has been attributed to either of the petitioners. Accused No. 3 specifically contends that he was not present at the scene of occurrence and arrived only after the incident, when he was informed about the injuries sustained by his

grandfather. He claims that, upon learning of the incident, he contacted the emergency helpline at 112, arranged for an ambulance, accompanied the injured person to the hospital, and paid the medical expenses. Accused No. 4 likewise denies participating in the alleged assault and contends that she merely informed her husband and sought assistance. Both petitioners deny having assaulted anyone or having shared a common intention to commit the alleged offences.

6.2. It is further submitted that Accused No. 1 has already been granted bail by the learned Sessions Court and that Accused No. 5 was granted interim protection from coercive steps by this Court on 31.09.2026 in Crl.P. No. 13991 of 2026, subject to the condition of cooperating with the investigation. The petitioners contend that their custodial interrogation is unnecessary, as they are permanent residents and there is no likelihood of their absconding, tampering with the evidence, or influencing the witnesses. They undertake to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. On these grounds, learned counsel seeks the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7.1. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the petitions, contending that the allegations are grave and serious. According to the prosecution, Accused No. 1 struck the victim on the head with a spade, causing a severe bleeding injury and loss of consciousness, while the

petitioners and the other accused allegedly assaulted the de facto complainant and other family members with their hands and feet and threatened them. It is further alleged that the accused took away the mobile phone of one of the victims while the incident was being recorded, and that the other victims sustained minor injuries. The injured victim subsequently succumbed to his injuries while undergoing treatment in the hospital, pursuant to which the offence was altered to one punishable under Section 103(1) of the BNS. The investigation is stated to be in progress.

7.2. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submits that A Accused No. 3 participated in the assault on L.Ws. 2 and 3 and that his specific role, together with the applicability of Section 3(5) of the BNS, requires further examination during the investigation. Placing reliance on the death of the injured person, the gravity of the allegations, the alleged assaults and threats, the reported criminal antecedents of Accused No. 3, and the ongoing investigation, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor seeks dismissal of the petitions.

8. I have carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the material available on record.

9. The offence was altered to one punishable under Section 103(1) of the BNS following the death of the injured person while undergoing

treatment. The gravity of the allegations and the circumstances resulting in the victim's death cannot be understated. Nevertheless, the specific allegation of inflicting the fatal head injury with a spade is directed against Accused No. 1. As regards Accused No. 3 and 4, their alleged participation in the assault on L.Ws. 2 and 3 must be independently assessed on the basis of the material collected during the investigation. Their alleged presence at the scene or their relationship with Accused No. 1, by itself, cannot justify automatically attributing to them participation in the fatal assault.

10. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565, and *Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, the Hon'ble Supreme Court recognised the discretionary jurisdiction of the Courts to grant anticipatory bail, having regard to the facts and circumstances of each case and subject to appropriate conditions where necessary to safeguard the investigation.

11. The prosecution submits that the investigation is still in progress. However, the material presently placed before this Court does not disclose any specific recovery, discovery, or other investigative step for which the custodial interrogation of either petitioner has been demonstrated to be necessary. Similarly, the apprehensions regarding non-cooperation, intimidation of witnesses, or tampering with evidence have not been substantiated by reference to any specific material

placed before this Court. While the gravity of the alleged offence and the death of the victim are undoubtedly relevant considerations, the mere pendency of the investigation does not, by itself, establish that the arrest and custodial interrogation of the petitioners are indispensable, particularly where their presence and cooperation can be secured through appropriate conditions. The reported criminal antecedents of Accused No. 3 are also a relevant consideration. However, their nature, present status, and bearing on the question of pre-arrest bail require verification and assessment before their significance can be properly determined. Mere registration or pendency of criminal cases does not, in itself, establish the guilt of Accused No. 3 in the present case. Likewise, the grant of bail to Accused No. 1 and the interim protection granted to Accused No. 5 may be considered only to the extent that their respective roles and the circumstances governing their cases are comparable with those of the petitioners.

12. In the above circumstances, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the ultimate culpability of the petitioners, this Court is inclined to allow the petitions for anticipatory bail, subject to appropriate conditions to secure the presence of the petitioners, ensure their cooperation with the investigation, and safeguard the interests of the investigation.

13. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to the following conditions:

a) Petitioner Nos.1 and 2/Accused Nos.3 and 4 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, KPHB police station, Cyberabad Commissionerate on or before 07.11.2026. Upon such surrender, or in the event of their arrest, the Station House Officer shall release them on bail upon each of them executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen 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 Station House Officer every Tuesday and Thursday between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. for a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of his release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.

c) The petitioners shall furnish their complete residential addresses and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the proceedings before the trial court.

d) Additionally, the petitioners shall remain available as and when required by the investigating officer during the course of investigation.

e) The petitioners shall neither directly nor indirectly induce, threaten, influence, nor contact any prosecution witness, nor shall they tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

f) In the event of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions by the petitioners, the prosecution shall be at liberty to take appropriate steps seeking cancellation of bail.

14. 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.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 26.10.2026

N.TUKARAMJI, J

MRKR

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N. TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.16572 AND 16666 OF 2026

26.10.2026

MRKR