

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD
WEDNESDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.LAKSHMAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE B.R.MADHUSUDHAN RAO
I.A.No. 1 OF 2024

IN

CRLA NO: 1201 OF 2024

Between

Renta Hemron, S/o Mangal Hemron.

... Appellant /Sole Accused

(Appellant in CRLA NO: 1201 OF 2024
on the file of High Court)

AND

The State of Telangana, through its Public prosecutor, having office at .T.S.
High Court, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENT/Respondent
(Respondent in-do-)

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI MOHAMMAD ADNAN

Counsel for the Respondent: Sri Syed Yasar Mamoon,
Additional PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

Appeal under Section 430 (1) of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed in support of the CRIMINAL APPEAL, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the operation of the judgment passed by the District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District, at LB Nagar, in SC NO. 671 OF 2024, dated 2nd December 2024, thereby releasing the petitioner on bail, pending disposal of CRLA No 1201 of 2024, on the file of the High Court.

The Court made the following

ORDER

Heard Mr. Mohammad Adnan, learned counsel for the petitioner/accused and Mr.Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent – State.

Petitioner herein is the sole accused in S.C.No.671 of 2024 on the file of the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Rangareddy District at L.B.Nagar.

Vide the impugned Judgment dated 02.12.2024, the learned trial Court convicted the petitioner herein for the offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that prosecution did not prove the motive. PW.2 is not an eye-witness. During his cross-examination, he has admitted that he did not witness the accused beating the deceased with M.O.2 – wooden log. The Investigating Officer did not collect finger prints. The contents of the charge sheet and depositions of the prosecution witnesses are lacking the ingredients of Section 302 of IPC and at the most, it amounts to Section 304 Part-II of IPC. Petitioner is in jail from 02.12.2024 onwards. Despite holding that there is no corresponding external injury to the internal injury found in the head of the deceased, learned trial Court convicted the petitioner under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment. He has placed reliance on the principle laid down by the Apex Court in *Raghav Prashad v. State of U.P.*¹.

Whereas, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that PW.2, eye-witness, specifically deposed about the role played by the petitioner. On consideration of the said aspects, more particularly, recovery of M.O.2 and deposition of PW.9 – Doctor, who conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased, learned trial Court rightly convicted the petitioner for the aforesaid offence and imposed the aforesaid imprisonment.

PW.2 is the colleague of the petitioner and the deceased. All of them are natives of West Bengal and they are working in SNR Infra Company. On 19.02.2024 at about 06.00 P.M. both the petitioner and the deceased were came to the room and while they are drinking alcohol, they fought with each other. Deceased shouted and abused the petitioner. There was

¹ AIR SC 2025 4547

fire wood stocked for the kitchen use. Petitioner beat the deceased with stick. When he came out, the deceased lying on the ground and the petitioner ran away. However, during his cross-examination, PW.2 admitted that he did not witness the fight. PW.9 – Doctor, who conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased, issued Ex.P.6 final opinion opining that the cause of the death of the deceased was due to head injury associated with alcohol intoxication.

On consideration of the said aspects only, learned trial Court convicted the petitioner for the offence under Section 302 of IPC and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment.

Prima facie, there are specific overt acts against the petitioner and the offence committed by the petitioner is grave and serious in nature.

In the light of the aforesaid discussion, we are not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused. Therefore, this petition is liable to be dismissed and accordingly, it is dismissed.

Sd/- AHMAD ABDULLA KHAN
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District, at LB Nagar. ✓
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison Cherlapalli, Medchal Malkajgiri District. ✓
3. The Station House Officer, P.S., Pahadishareef, Rachakonda. ✓
4. The State of Telangana, through its Public prosecutor, having office at .T.S. High Court, Hyderabad.[By SPAD] ✓
5. One CC to Sri. MOHAMMAD ADNAN Advocate [OPUC] ✓
6. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT] ✓
7. One spare copy ✓

HIGH COURT

**KL, J
&
BRMR, J**

DATED: 10-06-2026

ORDER

**I.A.No. 1 OF 2024
IN
CRLA NO: 1201 OF 2024**

I.A.DISMISSED

