



**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL No.      OF 2026**  
**[arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 2889 OF 2026]**

**SYED SULAIMAN @ TENKASI**

**APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF KARNATAKA**

**RESPONDENT**

**ORDER**

1. Leave granted.
2. This appeal is directed against the judgment and order dated 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in Criminal Appeal No. 450/2025 [21(NIA)].
3. The appeal was filed by the appellant challenging rejection of his prayer for bail *vide* order dated 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2023 of the trial court.
4. Appellant figures as accused no. 11 in an ongoing trial under the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 and the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967. Undisputedly, the appellant has suffered pre-trial incarceration for more than 12 (twelve) years.
5. In course of the trial, the evidence of more than 100 (hundred)

prosecution witnesses has been recorded till date. A few more remain to be examined. The trial is, therefore, likely to take some time to conclude.

6. Appellant's prayer for bail was premised on his wife's serious illness.

7. At one point of time, the Government of Karnataka had assessed escort charges in a sum of Rs.1,58,000/- (Rupees one lakh and fifty eight thousand) only which the appellant was required to bear if his prayer for bail were granted. Appellant could arrange only Rs.50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand) only and sought for waiver of the balance sum.

8. The prayer for waiver was disallowed, resulting in the appellant continuing in custody. Aggrieved thereby, the appellant is before us.

9. Appellant was granted liberty by an earlier order to file an application to bring on record documents supporting his claim that his wife has been suffering from serious illness. Such application was filed. We called upon the State of Karnataka to examine the authenticity of such documents and to file a reply affidavit.

10. A reply affidavit has since been filed. Reading such affidavit, we find the claim of the appellant as regards his wife's serious medical condition is correct.

11. In such view of the matter, we are inclined to grant the appellant interim bail for 60 (sixty) days, without making him liable to

pay any further amount towards escort charges, but subject to such terms and conditions as are imposed by the trial court. Ordered accordingly.

12. As a consequence, the impugned judgment and order stands set aside.

13. Immediately upon expiry of 60 (sixty) days from the date of release on interim bail, the appellant shall surrender.

14. It shall be the open to the State of Karnataka to maintain such appropriate surveillance if it has any apprehension of the appellant attempting to escape the rigours of law, once he is released from custody in terms of this order.

15. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed on the aforesaid terms.

16. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

.....J.  
**[DIPANKAR DATTA]**

.....J.  
**[SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA]**

**New Delhi;  
April 16, 2026.**

ITEM NO.27

COURT NO.8

SECTION II-E

**S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A**  
**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 2889/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 20-01-2026 in CRLA No. 450/2025 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

SYED SULAIMAN @ TENKASI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF KARNATAKA

Respondent(s)

IA No. 51891/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE  
IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 51890/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 16-04-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) : Dr. Alex Joseph, AOR  
Mr. Mayank Dwivedi, Adv.  
Ms. Dhruvi Sikarwar, Adv.  
Ms. Albina Sebastian, Adv.  
Ms. Supriya Verma, Adv.  
Mrs. Sangeetha Mr, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Naveen Sharma, AOR  
Mrs. Swati Bhushan Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. S.k. Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Payal Gola, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order placed on the file.

(JATINDER KAUR)  
P.S. to REGISTRAR

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)