

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

MONDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.LAKSHMAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

I.A.No.1 OF 2026

IN

CRLA NO: 377 OF 2021

Between

Kurma Venkateshulu @ Venkat Chinna @ Venkatesh, S/o. Late Venkatappa

...Petitioner/Appellant

(Appellant in CRLA NO: 377 OF 2021
on the file of High Court)

AND

State of Telangana, rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad for the state of
Telangana.

...Respondent/Complainant

(Respondent in-do-)

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI AMMAJI NETTEM

**Counsel for the Respondent: SRI M. RAMACHANDRA REDY, Addl. PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR**

Application under Section 430(1) of B.N.S.S. praying that in the circumstances
stated in the Interim Bail Application, the High Court may be pleased to enlarge the petitioner
on Bail by suspending the execution of the sentence of imprisonment imposed against the
petitioner in Judgment dated 18-12-2016 passed in S C No.191 of 2017 on the file of the
Court of the IV Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge at Hyderabad;

The Court made the following

ORDER:

**Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. M.Ramchandra Reddy,
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent-State.**

**Petitioner herein is the sole accused in S.C. No.181 of 2017 on the file of the
learned IV Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad. *Vide* the**

impugned Judgment dated 18.12.2020, the learned trial Court convicted the petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that there is no direct evidence to the incident and the version of prosecution witnesses is unbelievable. The Investigating Officer did not seize the motor cycle. The statement of PW.14 was recorded after one month from date of the incident. There is no last scene theory. The deceased did not raise any hue and cry at the time of incident and he is not a child. Without considering the said aspects, learned trial Court convicted the petitioner herein for the aforesaid offence and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment. He is in jail from the year 2018.

Whereas, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would contend that the learned trial Court convicted the petitioner for the aforesaid offence basing on the evidence of prosecution witnesses. PW.14 is eye-witness and also injured witness. Test identification parade was also conducted. Petitioner is having criminal history and he involved in ten (10) cases, out of which four (4) cases were ended in conviction. In one case, NBWs are pending. Therefore, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the present application.

It is apt to note that PW.14 – eye witness and also injured witness, specifically deposed with regard to the offence committed by the petitioner. He has also stated that the accused informed that he is a don of that area and already he killed one person and also underwent jail. Accused beat PW.14 and snatched away Rs.2,000/- cash from him. He has also stated with regard to the person, the accused has taken on a motor cycle. Even then, nothing was elicited from him during cross-examination.

PW.15 deposed about conducting of test identification parade, etc. According to the prosecution, petitioner involved in ten (10) cases including the present case. Four (4) cases were ended in conviction including the present case. In Crime No.1131 of 2018, the offences alleged against him are under Sections 384, 448 and 506 of IPC. In Crime No.501 of 2015, the offences alleged against

him are under Sections 323, 324, 506 of IPC. In Crime No.144 of 2019, the offence alleged against him is under Section 386 of IPC. In four cases, petitioner was convicted by the trial Courts. Petitioner is a habitual offender. His criminal history is from 2014 to 2018.

In the light of the aforesaid discussion, we are not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner herein and the several grounds and contentions raised by the petitioner can be considered at the time of hearing of the appeal finally.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

Sd/- S.MALLIKARJUNA RAO
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The IV Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge at Hyderabad.
2. The Superintendent, Jail at Sangareddy, District Sangareddy.
3. One CC to Sri. AMMAJI NETTEM Advocate [OPUC]
4. One CC to Sri. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR (TG) Advocate [OPUC]
5. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

**KL, J
&
VRKR, J**

DATED: 20-07-2026

LIST ON 19-08-2026

ORDER

**I.A.No. 1 OF 2026
IN
CRLA NO: 377 OF 2021**

DISMISING THE I.A.

