

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE: CrI.A.No.1133 of 2024

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	08.06.2026	<u>KL, J & BRMR, J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2024</u> <u>In</u> <u>CrI.A.No.1133 of 2024</u> Heard Mr. C.Pratap Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. C.Sunil Anand, learned counsel for the petitioner/accused and Mr. Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor. Petitioner herein is the sole accused in S.C.No.643 of 2021 on the file of the learned IV Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District, L.B.Nagar. <i>Vide</i> the impugned Judgment dated 09.12.2024, learned trial Court convicted the petitioner herein for the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment. Mr. C.Pratap Reddy, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, would contend that there are no eye-witnesses to the incident and the prosecution failed to prove the motive. Though there is no evidence that the petitioner developed illicit intimacy with the deceased, learned trial Court gave a finding that the petitioner maintained illicit relationship with the deceased. PW.1 is the owner of the scene of offence, PWs.4 and 5 are the daughters of the deceased, PW.6 is	

	the friend of PW.3 and PW.7 is brother of the deceased. All of them did not support the prosecution. Without considering the said aspects, learned trial Court convicted the petitioner herein and imposed maximum sentence of life imprisonment. He is in jail from 09.12.2024. Whereas, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would contend that though there is no direct evidence, the prosecution has proved that the circumstances relied upon by them formed a complete chain. On consideration of the said aspects only, learned trial Court convicted the petitioner herein and the offence committed by the petitioner is grave and serious in nature. As rightly contended by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, PW.1 is the owner of the scene of offence. He deposed that accused used to come to the house of the deceased now and then. On enquiry, deceased informed that accused is her brother. PW.1 did not depose about the offence committed by the petitioner herein. Admittedly, PWs.2 and 3 are sister and brother-in-law of the deceased respectively. Their evidence is also not useful to prove the offence committed by the petitioner herein. PWs.4 and 5 are elder daughter and younger daughter of the deceased. PW.6 is the friend of PW.3 and PW.7 is brother of the deceased	
--	---	--

		respectively, did not support the prosecution. It is also apt to note that PW.12 is the holder of Airtel Sim Card bearing No.8106808005. It is specifically deposed that he threw the sim card, since it was not working. It is a settled principle that even basing on the circumstantial evidence, learned trial Court can record conviction against the accused provided circumstances relied upon by the prosecution form a complete chain. However, the several grounds and contentions raised by the petitioner and the prosecution can be considered at the time of hearing of the appeal finally. In the light of the same, we are inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused. The sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioner herein/accused, <i>vide</i> impugned Judgment dated 09.12.2024 in S.C. No.643 of 2021 on the file of the learned IV Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District, L.B.Nagar, alone is suspended pending disposal of the Appeal, and the petitioner/accused, namely, Srikanth Kandgule, S/o. Jagannath Kandgule, is released on bail on the following conditions:- i) He shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with two (02) sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned IV Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District, L.B.Nagar.	
--	--	--	--

		ii) He shall not indulge in any criminal activities while he is on bail. KL, J BRMR, J <u>Crl.A.No.1133 of 2024</u> List on 16.09.2026. B/o. PNS	
--	--	---	--

--	--	--	--