

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
MAIN CASE: Crl.A.No.586 of 2024

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	16.03.2026	<u>KL,J & BRMR,J</u> <u>I.A.No.2 of 2025</u> Heard Sri P.Prabhakar Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner/Accused No.1 and Sri Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor. Petitioner is Accused No.1 in S.C.No.110 of 2015. <i>Vide</i> impugned judgment dated 08.04.2024, learned Additional District and Sessions Judge at Godavarikhani, convicted him for the offence under Sections 498-A r/w 34, 302 r/w 34, 201 r/w 34, 304-B r/w 34 of IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act r/w 34 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment for the offence under Section 302 of IPC. He is in jail from 08.04.2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the marriage of the petitioner/A1 with the deceased was a love marriage and it is against the wishes of her parents. They never visited her parents' house. Even then, they have created a story of dowry death. There is no direct evidence. The depositions of P.Ws.6 and 10 cannot be believed. He has 12 years old daughter and she is staying with his sister. Without considering the said aspects, learned trial Court convicted him.	

		Whereas, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would contend that the deceased is wife of the petitioner, he was found in the house/scene of offence, as spoken to by P.W.6. Therefore, petitioner has to explain the reason for death of his wife in terms of Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act. On consideration of the said aspects only, learned trial Court convicted him. In light of the aforesaid submissions, a perusal of the record reveals that, according to the prosecution, Accused Nos. 2 and 3 maintained an illicit relationship, and the deceased was coming in their way to the continuation of the said relationship. Therefore, they instigated the petitioner/Accused No. 1 to demand additional dowry of Rs. 10.00 lakhs and to do away with the life of the deceased. In furtherance of the said plan, the petitioner/A1 demanded additional dowry, which the deceased could not meet. Consequently, he allegedly set her ablaze by pouring kerosene on her. P.W.6, who is a neighbor of the petitioner, categorically deposed that she observed the petitioner/A1 coming out of his house, after which other neighbors also entered the said house. P.W.10, another neighbor, also deposed on the same lines as P.W.6. P.W.16 is the Doctor, who conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased. According to him, the	
--	--	--	--

cause of death is Cardio pulmonary arrest due to asphyxia due to compression over the neck. He has issued Ex.P12/Post Mortem Examination report.

Even according to the prosecution, petitioner killed his wife and then burned her dead body.

Prima facie, there are specific allegations against the petitioner herein. The offence committed by him is grave and serious. In the light of the same, we are not inclined to grant bail to him. Therefore, this application is liable to be dismissed and accordingly the same is dismissed.

KL,J

BRMR,J

Crl.A.No.586 of 2024

List on 01.07.2026.

B/o.kvs

