

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE AT KHAMMAM

PRESENT: SRI G.RAJA GOPAL
PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE,

Tuesday, April 21, 2026

Crl MP No.312 of 2026
in Crime No.19 of 2026 of PS Khammam I Town

BETWEEN:

- 1) Bomma Sravan Kumar S/o Veeranna, 38 years, Outsourcing Employee in Palvoncha Transco Tower, R/o H.No.10-1-116, Chakali Bazar, Sub Station Road, Paloncha Town, Bhadradri Kothagudem District
- 2) Gadidasi Rajesh S/o Srinivas, 36 years, Coolie, R/o H.No.15-5-23/1, Ramavaram, Kothagudem Town, Bhadradri Kothagudem District

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2

AND

The State of Telangana represented by the Public Prosecutor

... Respondent

Counsel for Petitioners	: Sri D.Ramu,
Counsel for Respondent	: Sri J.Sarat Kumar Reddy, Public Prosecutor

This petition coming on 17.04.2026 for hearing; upon hearing the counsel on record and considering the material on record and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court has made the following:

ORDER

This is a 3rd bail petition filed by the petitioners/A1 and A2 under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of bail in crime No.19 of 2026 of PS Khammam I Town for the offence under Sections 103 (1) read with 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (302 IPC).

2. Notice given to the learned Public Prosecutor, who filed counter and opposed the petition.

3. Heard arguments from both sides.
4. Now, the point for consideration in this petition is:
 - 1) Whether the petitioners/A1 and A2 are entitled for grant of bail as prayed for?
 - 2) To what relief?

POINT No.1:

5. The case of prosecution in nutshell is that the deceased Madem Prameela, who is the cousin sister of defacto complainant/Bommagani Ramakrishna, married Madem Narasimha Rao. After their marriage they used to reside in a rented house of accused No.1 situated at Chakali Bazar, Paloncha. In the year 2019 disputes arose between them, as such they are living separately since then. By knowing the said fact, accused No.1 used to follow her in the name of love and threatened her to fulfill his sexual desire. Due to the unbearable harassment by accused No.1, the deceased changed her residence to Bhadrachalam, but the accused No.1 did not change his attitude and used to follow her and used to threaten her with dire consequences to kill, if she will not fulfill his sexual desire. Later, the deceased informed the same to the defacto complainant, upon which he suggested her to shift her residence to Khammam, accordingly she shifted her residence to Khammam and used to work as sales woman at Lillies Cloth stores at Kaman Bazar.

Further on knowing the fact that the deceased residing at Khammam, accused No.1 made a phone call to the deceased Prameela but she did not lift his call, due to which he got angry and decided to kill her and called accused No.2, who is his brother-in-law to his house, informed the matter to him and asked him to bring a knife. On 09.01.2026 evening hours accused No.2 brought a big knife which is used to cut trees. According to their plan, at around 17.30 hours accused Nos.1 and 2 left Paloncha and reached Khammam at around 20.30 hours and at around 21.30 hours when the deceased after completion of her work returning to home, meantime accused No.2 attacked on her with knife and beat on her head, as a result the deceased received injuries and died. On the same day at about 22.20 hours when the defacto complainant made a phone call to his sister but one unknown person lifted the call and informed about the death of the deceased.

6. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners/A1 and A2 is that the petitioners/A1 and A2 are no way concerned with the alleged offence and they never committed any offence as alleged and all the allegations are utterly false and baseless; and that the ingredients of Section 103(1) read with 3(5) of BNS does not attract to the present case as per averments made in the report; and that entire investigation is completed, as such there is no question of tampering the evidence; and that the petitioners are law abiding citizens and ready to prove their innocence and urged to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

7. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor opposed the petition contending that the investigation is not yet completed and if the petitioners/A1 and A2 are released on bail, they may threaten the eye witnesses and independent witnesses and there is every possibility of law and order problem; and that FSL report yet to be received and prayed to dismiss the petition.

8. On perusal of the record, it reveals that the petitioners/A1 and A2 were remanded to judicial custody on 12.01.2026 and that the earlier bail petitions of petitioners/A1 and A2 were dismissed by this Court vide Crl MP Nos.117 of 2026 and 226 of 2026 dated 26.02.2026 and 18.03.2026 respectively.

By considering the remand period of petitioners/A1 and A2 as statutory period of 90 days was already completed and by this time entire investigation might have been completed except filing of the charge-sheet. Therefore, in the circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners/A1 and A2 on bail. Accordingly, this point is answered.

Point No.2: To what relief?

9. As a result, the petition is allowed and the petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 2 are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for Rs.50,000/-(Rupees Fifty Thousand only) each together with two sureties each for a like sum. After release, the petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 2 shall appear

before SHO concerned on every Sunday between 10.00 am to 04.00 PM until further orders.

Typed to my dictation by the Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 21st day of April, 2026.

**PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE
KHAMMAM**

Copy to:

The Station House Officer, P.S.Khammam I Town