

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT
HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.17902 and 17906 of 2025

DATE: 06.01.2026

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17902 of 2025

BETWEEN:

Korivi Mahesh and 2 others

.... Petitioners/
Accused Nos.1, 2 & 4

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
Through P.S. Athmakur (S),
Suryapet District.

.... Respondent/Complainant

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17906 of 2025

BETWEEN:

Pusapally Janardhan

.... Petitioner/Accused No.5

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
Through P.S. Athmakur (S),
Suryapet District.

.... Respondent/Complainant

COMMON ORDER

Since the issue involved in both the criminal petitions is one and the same, these criminal petitions were heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

2. These criminal petition is filed under Sections 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioners/Accused Nos.1, 2, 4 and 5 seeking enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No.221 of 2025 of Athmakur (S) Police Station, Suryapet District. The offences alleged against the petitioners are under Sections 61(2), 126(2), 103 read with 3(5) of BNS.

3. The brief facts of the case are that on 21-10-2025, the complainant Gundala Narsaiah reported to the police that his sister Korivi Bhikshamamma was murdered by her husband Korivi Mallaiah, his son Praveen, his nephew Korivi Mahesh, and Mahesh's friends Vamsi and Janardhan. The complainant alleged that his sister was harassed and threatened by the accused due to suspicions of her having an illicit relationship. On the day of the incident, the accused allegedly attacked Bhikshamamma in Sudagani Bazaar, with Mahesh and Vamsi

stabbing her to death. The complainant requested legal action against the five accused. On receipt of the said complaint, a crime was registered against the accused persons.

3. Heard Sri Veera Babu Gandu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners as well as Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent – State.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the crime, with no connection to the alleged offence. In fact, the victim did not reside with her husband; she left him on the date of the agreement, i.e., 18.07.2025, and there has been no relationship between the husband and wife since then. She has been residing in Suryapet, and therefore, the question of honour killing does not arise. He further submitted that a test identification parade was conducted by the Court, and none of the witnesses identified the accused and that the entire investigation has been completed. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioners by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, contending that the crime involves serious allegations. He argued that there are no specific allegations against the accused and that the investigation is not yet complete. In view of the gravity of the allegations, the question of granting bail to the petitioners would not arise at this stage. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and on a perusal of the material available on record, it is observed that the petitioners have been in judicial custody since 23.10.2025. As seen from the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, LWs.1 to 19, including the Investigating Officer, have already been examined. The test identification parade has also been completed, and the PME report has been received by the Investigating Authority. Except for the filing of the charge sheet, the remaining investigation has been completed. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including the nature of the allegations, and the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall execute 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 learned Principal Junior Civil Judge-cum-Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Suryapet.
- ii. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) week or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.
- iii. The petitioners shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).
- iv. The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly contact, influence, threaten, or induce the complainant, witnesses, or any person acquainted with the facts of the case, and shall maintain absolute peace and good conduct during the pendency of the trial.
- v. The petitioners shall not leave the territorial jurisdiction of the concerned

Court/District without prior permission
from the trial Court.

- vi. In the event the petitioners are involved
in any other offence or violates any of
the above conditions, the prosecution
may move for cancellation of bail.

- 7. Accordingly, these Criminal petitions are allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand
closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 06.01.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.17902 and 17906 of 2025

Date: 06.01.2026

SS