

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

**MONDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

:PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.LAKSHMAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NARSING RAO NANDIKONDA**

IA No. 3 OF 2025

IN

CRLA NO: 264 OF 2025

Between:

Poleboina Lingaiah, S/o. Illaiah, Occ. Sarpanch, R/o. Azeempet Village, Addagudur
Mandal, Nalgonda District.

**...Petitioner/Appellant
(Appellant in CRLA 264 OF 2025
on the file of High Court)**

AND

The State of Telangana, rep. by P.P. High Court for the State of Telangana at
Hyderabad.

**...Respondent/Complainant
(Respondents in-do-)**

Counsel for the Petitioner :Sri P PRABHAKAR REDDY

**Counsel for the Respondent :Sri Syed Yasar Mamoon, Additional PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR**

Petition under Section 430 of BNSS, praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed in support of the criminal petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the sentence in Session Case No 45 of 2018 Dated 18/02/2025 on the file of The Special Sessions Judge for Trial of SCs/ STs POA Act Cases-cum-II Additional District and Sessions Judge at Nalgonda and to release the petitioner on bail, pending disposal of CRLA No. 264 of 2025, on the file of the High Court.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the grounds filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of above mentioned counsel.

The Court made the following

ORDER:

**Heard Mr. P.Prabhakar Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and
Mr. Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor.**

Petitioner is accused No.18 in S.C.No.45 of 2013. *Vide* judgment dated 18.02.2025, learned Special Sessions Judge for Trial of SCs/STs (POA) Act Cases-cum-II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Nalgonda, convicted the petitioner for the offences under Sections 109, 302, 143, 147 of IPC and 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015. The petitioner was sentenced to undergo life imprisonment. This is the second bail application filed by him. *Vide* order dated 25.10.2025, we have dismissed the first bail application filed by the petitioner. *Vide* I.A.No.1 of 2025, we have considered all the contentions raised by the petitioner herein.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that prosecution failed to prove the motive. Even PW2/wife of the deceased admitted that there are no disputes between the deceased and the petitioner herein. There is delay in lodging the complaint and there is also delay in FIR reaching the Court. Petitioner was implicated due to political enmities. He is in jail from 28.02.2025. Without considering the said aspects, learned trial Court convicted him. There are fair chances of petitioner succeeding in the present appeal. With the said submission, he sought bail to the petitioner herein.

Whereas, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would contend that on consideration of all the said aspects, this Court has dismissed the first bail application filed by the petitioner. There is no change of circumstances from the said date.

PW1 is the son of the deceased. In his chief examination, he has specifically stated that the petitioner was the Sarpanch of that village. At 06.00 p.m. on 30.09.2017, all of them went to Jammi tree and performed puja. When they were returning, petitioner/Sarpanch of the said village instigated all the other accused to kill his father. He has also specifically deposed that accused killed his father, suspecting that he is responsible for the death of one Rajamallu, who died in the year 2013. PW2 is the wife of the deceased. She also spoke in the same lines. However, during cross examination, she has admitted that petitioner and deceased were not

having any disputes. Petitioner belongs to Yadava Community. He instigated other accused to kill her husband. Thus, she has specifically deposed about the role played by the petitioner herein. PW3 is daughter of deceased. She also spoke on the very same lines. PWs.1 to 3 specifically deposed that petitioner was present at the time of incident. He gave the signal and left the place. On consideration of the said aspects only, *vide* order dated 25.10.2025, we have dismissed I.A.No.1 of 2025 i.e., first bail application filed by the petitioner herein. There is no change of circumstances from 25.10.2025 to till date.

There is no dispute with regard to the legal position that the petitioner can file successive bail applications. At the same time, he has to make out a case to show the change of circumstances from the date of dismissal of first bail application and second bail application. There is no change of circumstances from 25.10.2025 to till date.

In the light of the same, we are not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner-accused No.18. Therefore, this application is liable to be dismissed and accordingly, it is dismissed.

Sd/- N.CHANDRA SEKHAR RAO
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Special Session Judge for Trial of SCs/STs POA Act Cases-cum-II Additional District and Sessions Judge at Nalgonda.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Cherlapally, Medchal – Malkajgiri District. (by Special Messenger)
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station Addagudur, Dist. Yadadri-Bhongir.
4. One CC to SRI P.PRABHAKAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, High Court at Hyderabad [OUT]
6. Two spare copies

HIGH COURT

KL, J

&

NNR, J

DATED:29/12/2025

NOTE: LIST ON 08.04.2026.

ORDER

IA No. 3 OF 2025

IN

CRLA.No.264 of 2025

I.A. IS DISMISSED

