

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10831 OF 2026

DATE : 20.07.2026

Between:

Manne Sai Kumar

...Petitioner

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 No.2 in FIR No.152 of 2026 of Lalaguda Police Station, Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Section 109 read with 3(5) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, "BNS").

3. Heard Mr.C.V.Srinath, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State.

4. The prosecution case, in brief, is that, against the backdrop of a dispute concerning repayment, on 09.04.2026, at about 10:20 p.m., the petitioner/Accused No.2 and Accused No.1 allegedly went to the house of the de facto complainant. It is alleged that Accused No.1 threw chilli powder, while the petitioner splashed petrol on the face of the de facto complainant and attempted to set him on fire. Upon hearing the commotion, the neighbours intervened, whereupon the petitioner/Accused No.2 and Accused No.1 fled the scene. Based on the report lodged by the de facto complainant, the present crime came to be registered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and that a false case has been foisted against him in order to overcome the complaint lodged by the petitioner's mother. According to the said complaint, on 09.04.2026, between 10:30 p.m. and 11:00 p.m., the sons of the de facto complainant attacked Accused No.1 and the petitioner herein, causing them grievous injuries, which ultimately resulted in the death of Accused No.1. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been undergoing inpatient treatment since the date of the incident on account of the injuries sustained by him. Learned counsel contends that the present case has been falsely registered only to shield the accused in Crime No.153 of 2026. He further submits that the petitioner is a permanent resident, undertakes to cooperate with the investigation, to appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required, and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by

this Court. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition, contending that, as per the report and the material collected during the course of the investigation, the petitioner/Accused No.2 had accompanied Accused No.1 (since deceased) to the house of the de facto complainant, where, acting in concert, Accused No.1 threw chilli powder and the petitioner splashed petrol on the de facto complainant. He further submits that the investigation is still in progress and that eight witnesses have been examined thus far. He fairly concedes that, in the counter-case, the petitioner sustained grievous injuries and is presently unwell and undergoing medical treatment. According to the prosecution, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be necessary for the purpose of an effective investigation, and the grant of anticipatory bail may adversely affect his cooperation with the Investigating Agency. He therefore prays for dismissal of the petition.

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

8. A prima facie consideration of the prosecution case and the material placed before this Court discloses that the incident alleged in the present crime was followed by another occurrence on the very same day, allegedly involving the children of the de facto complainant, in which the

petitioner/Accused No.2 sustained grievous injuries. The record further indicates that the petitioner has been undergoing medical treatment as an inpatient since the date of the incident. The existence of a counter-case arising out of the same sequence of events is a relevant circumstance which cannot be ignored at this stage, as it prima facie suggests that the occurrence may have been part of a larger transaction requiring a fair and impartial investigation into the respective roles of the parties.

9. At the stage of considering an application for anticipatory bail, this Court is not expected to undertake a meticulous examination of the evidence or record any finding on the merits of the rival allegations. The Court is only required to assess whether, having regard to the nature of the accusations and the attendant circumstances, the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail is warranted.

10. Further, the power to grant anticipatory bail is intended to safeguard the personal liberty, while simultaneously ensuring that the investigation is not prejudiced. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra*, (2011) 1 SCC 694, wherein reiterated that personal liberty occupies a paramount position in constitutional jurisprudence and that arrest should not be resorted to merely because it is lawful to do so.

11. Having regard to the nature of the accusations, the existence of a counter-case arising out of the same transaction, the fact that the petitioner

himself sustained grievous injuries and continues to undergo medical treatment, his expressed willingness to cooperate with the investigation, his status as a permanent resident, and the absence of any material indicating that he is likely to abscond, tamper with the prosecution evidence, or influence witnesses, this Court is of the considered opinion that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear to be indispensable at this stage of the investigation. The object of arrest is to facilitate a fair investigation and not to inflict punishment before trial. Where the Investigating Agency can effectively carry out the investigation with the cooperation of the accused, denial of anticipatory bail would amount to an unnecessary curtailment of personal liberty. Appropriate conditions can adequately secure the petitioner's availability for investigation, while simultaneously protecting the interests of the prosecution.

12. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to the following conditions:

(A). The petitioner/Accused No.2 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Lalaguda Police Station, Hyderabad, on or before 03.08.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on execution of 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 petitioner shall remain available for interrogation as and when required during the course of investigation and shall extend full cooperation to the investigation.

(C) The petitioner shall furnish his complete residential address, mobile number and other contact particulars to the Investigating Officer and shall promptly intimate any change therein.

(D) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case, nor shall he tamper with prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

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. Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 20.07.2026
CHS

N.TUKARAMJI, J

45

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10831 OF 2026

DATE : 20.07.2026

CHS