

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

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.8600 OF 2026 AND 8792 OF 2026

DATE: 24.06.2026

Between :

Criminal Petition No.8600 of 2026:

Arige Ramesh and another.

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.10 and 11

AND

The State of Telangana
Through S.H.O. Medak Town P.S. Rep by its Public
Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.

... Respondent.

Criminal Petition No.8792 of 2026:

Jangamgari Srikanth Goud.

... Petitioner/Accused No.9

AND

The State of Telangana
Through S.H.O. Medak Town P.S. Rep by its Public
Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad.

... Respondent.

COMMON ORDER:

This petition is filed under Section 482 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, "BNSS"), seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioners are arrayed as Accused Nos.9 to 11 in FIR No.266 of 2026 on the file of Medak Town police station, Medak District registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238 r/w 3(5) of BNS.

3. Heard Mr. C. Hari Preeth, learned counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent/State.

4. The facts, in brief, are that the case relates to the alleged murder of one Kumar Goud, purportedly arising out of matrimonial disputes and allegations of an illicit relationship. On a complaint lodged by the brother of the deceased, a crime was registered. During the course of investigation, the involvement of the petitioners in the alleged occurrence is stated to have surfaced on the basis of the alleged confessional statements of accused Nos.1 and 4, pursuant to which they came to be arrayed as accused Nos.9 to 11.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were not named in the FIR and that no specific overt acts have been attributed to them in connection with the alleged offence. It is contended that the remand report contains specific allegations only against accused Nos.1 to 5 and that the petitioners have subsequently been implicated solely on the basis of the confessional statement of a co-accused, which, by itself, has no evidentiary value. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners are permanent residents of the locality and that there is no likelihood of their absconding, tampering with the prosecution evidence, or influencing witnesses. It is also submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. On these grounds, learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor opposed the petition and submitted that the allegations in the complaint disclose a grave and heinous offence involving the murder of Kumar Goud. It is contended that the deceased, who was serving in the Army and had come home on leave, was allegedly maintaining an illicit relationship with another woman, which resulted in frequent disputes between him and his wife, as well as with his family members. Despite the intervention of village elders and counselling efforts, the deceased allegedly failed to mend

his ways, resulting in persistent discord between the families. It is further submitted that, on the relevant date, the accused, along with certain unidentified persons, allegedly came to the house of the deceased in two cars and picked up a quarrel with him over his alleged illicit relationship and the harassment caused to his wife. During the course of the altercation, the accused persons allegedly assaulted the deceased with stones and sticks with the intention of causing his death, thereby inflicting multiple injuries. On the following day, the deceased was shifted to a hospital, where he was declared dead. Therefore, considering the seriousness of the allegations learned Assistant Public Prosecutor prayed for dismissal of the anticipatory bail petition.

8. I have perused the materials on record and considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel.

9. The pleadings placed before this Court indicate that the petitioners were not named either in the complaint or in the FIR and that the allegations contained therein are specifically directed against accused Nos.1 to 5. The material presently brought on record shows that the petitioners were subsequently arrayed as accused Nos.9 to 11 in the remand report, ostensibly on the basis of the alleged confessional statement of accused No.1. At this stage, no specific overt acts have been attributed to the petitioners, nor does there appear to be any independent material demonstrating their participation in the

occurrence. Even the alleged confessional statements of accused Nos.1 and 4, except referring to the names of the petitioners, do not disclose any specific overt acts said to have been committed by them.

10. It is well settled that the grant of anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretionary relief intended to safeguard individual liberty and that its exercise depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. In the Instant case, notwithstanding the seriousness of the offences alleged, the material presently available does not disclose any direct accusation or specific overt act against the petitioners, whose implication appears to rest primarily upon the statements of co-accused persons.

11. Having regard to the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners, the material presently available on record, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the considered opinion that, notwithstanding the seriousness of the offence alleged, as there is no material indicating any likelihood of the petitioners absconding, evading the process of law, this Court is of the considered view that the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail deserves to be extended to the petitioners, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure their availability for investigation and to adequately safeguard the interests of the prosecution.

12. Accordingly, the Criminal Petitions are allowed. The petitioners/accused Nos.9 to 11 shall be enlarged on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.266 of 2026 of Medak Town Police Station, Medak District, subject to the following conditions:

- a) Petitioners/Accused Nos.9 to 11 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Medak Town police station, on or before 07.07.2026. Upon such surrender, or in the event of their arrest, the Station House Officer shall release them on bail upon each of them executing 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 said officer.
- b) The petitioners shall furnish their complete residential addresses and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the proceedings before the trial court.
- c) The petitioners shall appear before the Station House Officer every Tuesday between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. for a period of ten (10) weeks from the date of his release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.
- d) Additionally, the petitioner shall remain available as and when required by the investigating officer during the course of investigation.
- e) The petitioners shall neither directly nor indirectly induce, threaten, influence, nor contact any prosecution witness, nor shall they tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

f) In the event of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions by the petitioners, the prosecution shall be at liberty to take appropriate steps seeking cancellation of bail.

13. It is made clear that any observations made herein are confined solely to the adjudication of the present application for anticipatory bail and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 24.06.2026

N.TUKARAMJI, J

MRKR

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N. TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8600 OF 2026

24.06.2026

MRKR