IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NARSING RAO NANDIKONDA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18521 of 2026

(CNR No.HBHC010774362026)

DATE: 17.11.2026

Between:

Theegala Sai Kumar and others

...Petitioners

AND

The State of Telangana ***...Respondent***

O R D E R

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhitha, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 in Crime.No.612 of 2026 on the file of the Sircilla Town Police Station, Rajanna Sircilla District, registered by the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 85 and 123 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (for short 'DPA').

2. The case of prosecution in brief is that on 13.04.2025 at Sircilla, petitioner No.1 married the complainant. Subsequently, after the marriage, the petitioners were harassing the complainant for additional dowry and recently petitioner No.1

called her and demanded an additional dowry of Rs.10 lakhs to take her back to his society. Thereafter, on 16.08.2026, the accused persons mixed phenyl and camphor in her steel drinking water bottle, after consumption the same, she fell ill and had treated at the Government General Hospital, Sircilla the next day. Basing on the allegation, the above crime came to be registered against the petitioners.

3. Heard Mr. Nagula Nikhil Goutham, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. E. Ganesh, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners submitted that petitioners are innocent and have not committed the alleged offence and they were falsely implicated in the above crime. He further submitted that according to the allegations made in the complaint, the ingredients of Sections 85 and 123 are not made out against the petitioners; and that the petitioners submitted that no phenyl, camphor or any other substance was ever mixed in an drinking water or other article of the complainant by any of the petitioners and no such incident occurred on 16.08.2026 or on any other date. The petitioners also

contended that they never demanded any dowry from the complainant or her parents.

5. *Per contra*, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail and contended that the allegations made against the petitioners are serious in nature and submitted that the petitioners have committed grave offence and they are not entitled for the bail and if the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail at this stage, they may tamper with the evidence and may threaten the witnesses, and hence, prayed to dismiss the petition.

6. Having heard the contentions and rival contentions of both the parties and upon perusal of the material placed on record, admittedly petitioner No.1/A1 is the husband of the de-facto complainant, while petitioner Nos.2 and 3 (A2 and A3) are her in-laws. It is pertinent to mention that, on perusal of the complaint, the de-facto complainant specifically stated that there were matrimonial disputes between the parties and that the matter had been referred to the family elders. She further alleged that on 16.08.2026, A1 to A3, with an intention to kill her, mixed phenyl and camphor in the drinking water and forcibly administered the same to her.

7. It is observed that the said alleged complaint was lodged after a prolonged delay of 77 days and that it appears to be an after thought. The learned counsel for the petitioner, while making his submissions, he placed certain additional documents and material papers on record to show that the de-facto complainant had attended the office on the very next day of the alleged incident. He contended that there was no forcible administration of water mixed with phenyl and camphor and therefore, the question of administering any poisonous substance does not arise. He further submitted that the petitioners are apprehending arrest, are permanent residents of Sircilla, and have no criminal antecedents. Hence, there is no likelihood of their absconding or evading the process of law.

8. However, upon consideration of the entire material available on record and the contentions raised by the petitioners, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners have made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Another relevant consideration is that petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are aged about 60 and 64 years, respectively. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any

justifiable reason to deny the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

9. For the aforesaid reasons, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 subject to the following conditions.

1. *The petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 shall surrender before the Station House Officer of P.S.Sircilla, Rajanna Sircilla, within ten (10) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 on bail on their executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand only) each with two sureties, for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the said officer.*
2. *After release, the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11.00 A.M. on every Saturday, 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.*
3. *The petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482 (2) Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhitha, 2023 and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.*

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, pending if any, shall stand closed.

_____

JUSTICE NARSING RAO NANDIKONDA

Date: 17.11.2026
vjb