IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.19028 of 2026
(CNR No.HBHC010796662026)

DATED: 23.11.2026

BETWEEN:

Yanamala Ram Charan Tej .... Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through represented by it's
Public Prosecutor, High Court .... Respondent/Complainant

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 in Crime No.1269 of 2026, Miyapur Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, on bail. The said crime was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 108 of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 02.09.2026, the de-facto complainant, who is the brother of the deceased, lodged a report before the police, alleging that his sister, Soujanya, aged 33 years, was married to Vasupalli Bharat Reddy about 12 years ago and they have two daughters. On 02.09.2026, at about 12:30 hours, his sister went into her bedroom and did not open the door for a considerable time. On being informed by his niece to his brother-in-law, his brother-in-law returned

home and, with the assistance of a carpenter, opened the locked door and found Soujanya hanging from the ceiling fan with a saree. She was immediately shifted to Yashoda Hospital, Hi-Tech City, where the doctors declared her brought dead. Based on the said report lodged by the defacto complainant, the police initially registered a case under Section 194(1) of BNSS. During the course of investigation, the section of law was altered to Section 108 of BNS, and the case was proceeded with for the above-mentioned offence.

3. Heard Sri Chandrashekhar Yadav S, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent - State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner, who has been in judicial custody since 06.10.2026, was falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that initially, on 02.09.2026, the case was registered as a suspicious death under Section 194 BNSS without showing any accused, and only after 23 days, i.e., on 25.09.2026, LW-1 lodged a further complaint alleging the petitioner's involvement in the deceased's suicide and that neither the remand case diary nor the complaint lodged by the brother of the deceased contains any specific allegation constituting the offence of abetment, therefore, prima facie, the provisions of Section 108 of BNS, are not attracted to the facts of the present case. In support of the aforesaid contention,

learned counsel relied upon the decision of this Court in *Gaddhe Chandra Shekar v. The State of Telangana*[1], wherein it was observed that the mere quarrels, expressions of anger, denial of a civil claim, or harsh words spoken in the context of disputes do not constitute abetment of suicide unless they are shown to have been intended to provoke, incite, or compel the deceased to take his life. It is further submitted that a substantial part of the investigation has already been completed and further detention of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation. Therefore, prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor opposed for grant of bail and on instructions submitted that the investigation is still in progress and that, if the petitioner is released on bail at this stage, he may hamper the investigation or influence the witnesses, and prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, and upon a perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since October 6, 2026. The primary allegation leveled against the petitioner is that he was in a relationship with the deceased, who

[1] TSHC: Crl.P.No.12654 of 2023, dated 26.11.2025

was his sister's classmate. The deceased subsequently married one Bharat and relocated to Bengaluru. Unable to bear the separation, the petitioner allegedly threatened to end his life and further threatened to forward their old photographs to her husband. It is additionally alleged that on the day preceding the incident, the petitioner messaged the deceased stating that he was visiting her flat, to which she replied, "don't come, I will die." A bare recital of these allegations indicates that, *prima facie*, the acts attributed to the petitioner do not constitute an active abetment or instigation compelling the deceased to commit suicide. The learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance upon the whatsApp chats between the deceased and the petitioner, wherein an affectionate and normal conversation took place. The learned counsel for the petitioner also placed on record a copy of the mail received by the petitioner from his employer, wherein the petitioner was called for an explanation for his continued absence and in the event of failure on the part of the petitioner to given any response, appropriate disciplinary action including his termination would be initiated.

7. Furthermore, the remand case diary reveals that the statements of the material prosecution witnesses (LWs 1 to 15) have already been recorded. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the stage of the investigation, the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, and the

relevant precedent of this Court relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner in *Gaddhe Chandra Shekar's case* (supra), this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused, subject to the following conditions:

i) The petitioner-accused shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only), with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned VIII Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally.

ii) The petitioner-accused shall appear before the concerned SHO between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., on every Sunday 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.

iii) The petitioner-accused shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

iv) The petitioner-accused shall not directly or indirectly influence, threaten, or induce any of the prosecution witnesses.

v) In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, J

Date: 23.11.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.19028 of 2026

DATED: 23.11.2026

SS