

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

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10003 OF 2026

DATE : 08.07.2026

Between:

Keshagani Anjaneyulu and 2 others

**...Petitioners/Accused Nos.2, 3 and
5**

AND

The State of Telangana.

...Respondent

ORDER:

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

2. The petitioner is arrayed as accused Nos.2, 3 and 5 in Crime No.147 of 2026 on the file of Munagala Police Station, Suryapet District, registered for the offence punishable under Section 108 read with 3(5) of BNS.

3. Heard Mr. C.Sharan Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.Syed Yasar Mahmood, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State.

4. The petition of the petitioner No.2/accused No.3 is dismissed as not pressed.

5. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the deceased and the daughter of accused No.1, who are from different faiths fell in love and married on 19.06.2026 at a Shiva Temple, thereafter left the village. On 21.06.2026, when they were at Jaggayyapeta, petitioner No.3/accused No.5 allegedly saw them and informed accused No.1. Thereupon, accused No.1, along with petitioner No.1/ accused Nos.3 and 4, proceeded to Jaggayyapeta, and together with petitioner No.3/accused No.5, went to the place where the deceased and the daughter of accused No.1 were staying. It is further alleged that accused Nos.1 and 4 went inside that place assaulted the deceased, threatened him, abused him in filthy language, and forcibly taken away the daughter of the accused No.1 in an auto. On the following day, allegedly due to the acts of the petitioners and the other accused, the deceased was found hanging with a rope in front of the veranda of his house. A report was lodged, pursuant to which the present crime came to be registered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present crime. He further submits that, to constitute the offence of abetment of suicide, there must be a positive act of instigation or intentional aid

on the part of the accused, which is conspicuously absent in the present case. It is further contended that, even as per the averments in the remand report, the only allegation against accused No.5 is that he informed accused No.1 about the whereabouts of the deceased, and that petitioner No.1/accused No.2 merely accompanied accused No.1 and stood near the shop while accused No.1 and accused No.4 approached the deceased, and no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioners. Learned counsel further submits that as the acts attributed to the petitioners are falling short to satisfy the requirement of instigation, and as the petitioners are willing to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition and submitted that the material collected during investigation, including the voice recording of the deceased, indicates that the petitioners and the other accused acted in furtherance of their common intention and actively participated in threatening, abusing, and assaulting the deceased at Jaggayyapeta. It is further submitted that they participated in forcibly taking away the daughter of accused No.1. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor also submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioners may be necessary and, accordingly, prayed for dismissal of the application.

7. I have carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the material available on record.

8. The allegation against the petitioners is that they, along with the other accused, abetted the deceased to commit suicide. The material placed on record indicates that petitioner No.3 had noticed the deceased and the daughter of accused No.1 together and informed accused No.1. It is further alleged that petitioner No.2 accompanied accused No.1 and actively participated in forcibly taking away the wife of the deceased.

9. It is a well-settled proposition that, while considering an application for anticipatory bail, the Court is required to examine the gravity of the accusation, the specific role attributed to the accused, the possibility of the accused absconding, and whether custodial interrogation is genuinely necessary (*Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra (2011)*)¹. Similarly, in *Arnesh Kumar vs State of Bihar*², the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized that arrest should not be made as a matter of routine and that the investigating agency must justify the necessity of custodial interrogation.

10. In the instant case, notwithstanding the seriousness of the allegations, as the material presently available does not disclose any

¹ 2011 1 SCC 694

² 2014 8 SCC 273

specific overt act amounting to instigation on the part of the petitioners, and particularly the willingness expressed by the petitioners to cooperate with the investigation, the absence of any material indicating the likelihood of their absconding, and the absence of any compelling necessity for custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to extend the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure their availability for investigation and to safeguard the interests of the prosecution.

11. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed. The petitioners shall be enlarged on anticipatory bail, subject to the following conditions:

(A) The petitioners/Accused Nos.2 and 5 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Munagala Police Station, Suryapet on 23.07.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release them on bail on execution of a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) each, with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the said officer.

(B) The petitioners shall appear before the Investigating officer on every Tuesday and Saturday between 10.00AM to 03.00PM, for a

period of eight (08) weeks from the date of their release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.

(C) The petitioners shall furnish their complete residential address and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the course of investigation.

(D) The petitioners shall not either directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or contact any prosecution witness, nor shall they tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(E) The petitioners shall strictly comply with all the conditions contemplated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(F) Any willful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioners liable to appropriate proceedings before the Court concerned, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable laws.

12. 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.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 08.07.2026

rsp

N.TUKARAMJI, J

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10003 OF 2026

DATE : 08.07.2026

rsp