IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18636 of 2026
(CNR No.HBHC010777342026)

DATED: 17.11.2026

BETWEEN:

Rohit Kumar .... Petitioner/accused No.1

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through The Station House Officer,
P.S. Rajendranagar, Rep., by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad. .... Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 and 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking to enlarge the petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.2 in Cr. No.960 of 2026 of Rajendranagar Police Station, Hyderabad, on bail. The said crime was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103 (1) read with Section 3 (5) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner/accused No.1 along with accused Nos.2 and 3 allegedly assaulted the deceased by name Aniketh Kumar, who is the brother of the de-facto complainant. Due to the injuries suffered in the hands of accused, the deceased died in the hospital while undergoing treatment.

3. Heard Mr. S. Mahesh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Sri M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the accused Nos.2 and 3 were already enlarged on bail vide orders dated 30.10.2026 and 15.10.2026 in CRLP Nos.17466 and 16556 of 2026 respectively. It is further submitted that the petitioner/accused No.1 also stands on the same footing, as such, he is entitled for bail.

5. On the other hand, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor submitted that there are specific overt-acts against the petitioner/accused No.1 in the complaint as well as in the remand case diary. The offence leveled against the petitioner/accused No.1 is grave in nature and the charge sheet is yet to be filed.

6. The alleged offense appears to have occurred due to a dispute between the deceased and the accused arising out of monetary transactions between them. A perusal of the report lodged by the de facto complainant, who is the brother of the deceased, reveals specific overt acts attributed to the petitioner/Accused No. 1. Furthermore, the remand case diary indicates that the petitioner used the weapon, allegedly assaulting the deceased on the neck with a TMT iron rod, and the said weapon was recovered at his instance.

In contrast, the orders passed in Crl.P. Nos. 17466 and 16556 of 2026 establish that no specific overt acts were attributed to Accused Nos. 2 and 3. Given the clear nexus linking the petitioner to the alleged offence, he cannot claim parity with Accused Nos. 2 and 3 to seek bail. It is submitted that the petitioner/accused No. 1 is a permanent resident of Bihar and in the event of his enlargement on bail, there is every likelihood of him absconding and evading the jurisdiction of the Court, which would severely hamper the investigating agency in completing the investigation.

7. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record as there are grave allegations against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The Criminal Petition is devoid of merits and liable to be dismissed.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is dismissed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, J

Date: 17.11.2026
AS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18636 of 2026

DATED: 17.11.2026

AS