

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CONTEMPT CASE No.2485 of 2026

CNR.No.HBHC010305902026

DATE: 18.09.2026

Between:

Katta Vamsi Krishna.

PETITIONER

AND

A. Krishnaiah,
And another.

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

This Contempt Case is filed under Sections 10, 11 and 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 praying this Court to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of order dated 21.04.2026, subsequently extended *vide* orders dated 23.04.2026 and 27.04.2026 passed in CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026.

2. Heard Sri Y. Soma Srinath Reddy, learned counsel for petitioner, and Sri Palle Nageshwar Rao, learned Public Prosecutor, appearing for respondents.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that petitioner was arrayed as accused No.1 in FIR.No.413 of 2026 before the Saroor Nagar Police Station, for the offence punishable under Section 80 r/w. 3(5) of BNS, thereafter, he filed CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026 seeking anticipatory bail. This Court, on 21.04.2026 after hearing both sides, listed the matter on 23.04.2026 and passed interim direction to the Investigating Officer to not arrest the petitioner till 23.04.2026, and the said direction was subsequently extended on 23.04.2026 and 27.04.2026. He submitted that since the incident dated 19.04.2026, the petitioner was admitted in the hospital and was initially kept in the Intensive Care Unit and thereafter shifted to the Ward for observation and treatment, but from 21.04.2026 onwards, the respondents continuously harassed the petitioner and allegedly pressurized the hospital, Doctors and staff to discharge him with a view to arresting him, notwithstanding the interim orders of this Court protecting him from arrest.

Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner's father filed W.P.No.13930 of 2026, which is pending before this Court.

4. Learned counsel further submitted that, on 28.04.2026, the respondents allegedly compelled the hospital authorities to discharge the petitioner and thereafter brought him to the Police Station for arrest, despite being informed by his counsel of the subsisting orders in CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026. He asserted that in spite of repeatedly requesting the police officials to verify the orders from the official website of this Court, the respondents refused to recognize the said orders and proceeded with the arrest.

5. In addition, the learned counsel contended that respondent No.2 prevented the petitioner's counsel from meeting respondent No.1 and allegedly stated that the orders available on the High Court website were inconsequential. He averred that the petitioner was thereafter produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate at about 1:45 p.m., on 28.04.2026, seeking his remand under Section 187 of the BNSS, and when counsel opposed the

remand and brought the subsisting orders of this Court to the notice of the learned Magistrate, upon considering the said orders, the learned Magistrate rejected the remand and directed the release of the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner, incessantly contended that the respondents had been continuously harassing the petitioner and his parents in connection with the FIR. It is submitted that Accused No.2, the petitioner's father, was arrested and produced before the learned Magistrate on 20.04.2026, but his remand was returned. The respondents allegedly continued to harass the petitioner and his family and even pressured the hospital to discharge the petitioner despite his medical condition. It is further submitted that the respondents allegedly broke open the house of the petitioner's parents in an attempt to arrest the petitioner and his mother, notwithstanding the orders dated 21.04.2026 passed by this Court in Crl.P.Nos.6104 and 6109 of 2026 protecting them from arrest.

7. Learned counsel submitted that despite the respondents being aware that the petitioner was undergoing

treatment in the hospital and that police personnel were stationed outside the hospital, they described him as "absconding" in the remand case diary. It is further submitted that Accused No.2 was also shown as absconding in the remand case diary dated 28.04.2026 despite his arrest and production before the learned Magistrate. Learned counsel contended that the arrest of the petitioner, despite the subsisting orders of this Court and despite the respondents being specifically informed thereof, amounts to a deliberate disregard and violation of the orders of this Court. Therefore, prayed this Court to allow this Contempt Case and punish the respondents in accordance with law.

8. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor, vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, and submitted that pursuant to the complaint lodged by the mother of the deceased, a case in Cr.No.413 of 2026 was registered by Saroornagar Police Station on 19.04.2026 for the offences punishable under Section 80 read with Section 3(5) of the BNS. It is submitted that, as per the complaint, the deceased was married to A-1 on 27.01.2020 and was allegedly subjected to physical and

mental harassment and demands for additional dowry and money by A-1 and his parents, A-2 and A-3. On 18.04.2026, the deceased was found hanging in the bedroom of the house of A-1.

9. Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that A-3 initially approached this Court by filing CrI.P.No.6104 of 2026 seeking anticipatory bail, followed by A-1 filing CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026. Both petitions were heard together and, by common order dated 01.05.2026, anticipatory bail was granted to A-3, while CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026 filed by A-1 was dismissed. Thereafter, A-2 filed CrI.P.No.7866 of 2026 and was granted anticipatory bail by order dated 21.05.2026. Subsequently, A-1 filed CrI.P.No.7458 of 2026 and was also granted anticipatory bail by order dated 29.05.2026, subject to certain conditions.

10. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that the Investigating Officer has challenged the orders granting anticipatory bail by filing CrI.P.Nos.10944, 10943 and 10945 of 2026 seeking cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to A-1, A-2 and A-3 respectively,

and the said petitions are pending adjudication. With regard to the alleged violation of the interim order dated 27.04.2026 in CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that on 21.04.2026 this Court directed the Investigating Officer not to arrest A-1 till 23.04.2026, which interim protection was extended on 23.04.2026 and again on 27.04.2026, when the matter was directed to be listed under the caption "For Orders" on 30.04.2026 and the interim order was extended till then. However, the said CrI.P.No.6109 of 2026 was ultimately dismissed by the common order dated 01.05.2026.

11. Learned Public Prosecutor submitted that respondent No.2, Sri V. Maraiah, Sub-Inspector of Police, had no role in the investigation of the subject crime and was neither the Investigating Officer nor the officer who arrested A-1. It is therefore submitted that his impleadment in the contempt proceedings is misconceived and unwarranted. He asserted that respondent No.1 was not aware of the extension of the interim order dated 27.04.2026 at the time of arresting A-1 on 28.04.2026. It is submitted that, owing to the gravity of the offence, A-1 was arrested and produced before the

learned Magistrate for remand. At the time of remand, the counsel for A-1 brought the order dated 27.04.2026 to the notice of the learned Magistrate by filing a Memo, pursuant to which the learned Magistrate rejected the remand. It was only thereafter that respondent No.1 became aware of the extension of the interim protection. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that neither A-1 nor his counsel had furnished a copy of the said order to respondent No.1 or otherwise informed him of its subsistence prior to the arrest. Hence, the arrest was not in deliberate, intentional or wilful disobedience of the order passed by this Court.

12. Learned Public Prosecutor lastly submitted that respondent No.1, being a public servant, has the highest regard and respect for the judiciary and its orders and had no intention to commit contempt of this Court. Without prejudice to the above submissions, respondent No.1 has tendered an unconditional apology to this Court in the event this Court comes to the conclusion that any act on his part amounted to contempt, stating that the same was neither

intentional nor wilful. Therefore, prayed this Court to dismiss the Contempt Case.

13. Having regard to the rival submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the respective parties and upon perusing the material placed on record, it is noted that, admittedly, on 21.04.2026, after hearing both sides, this Court listed the matter on 23.04.2026 and passed an interim direction directing the Investigating Officer not to arrest the petitioner till 23.04.2026. The said interim protection was subsequently extended on 23.04.2026 and again on 27.04.2026. However, the record discloses that respondent No.1 arrested the petitioner on 28.04.2026 and produced him before the trial Court. Upon verification of the orders passed by this Court, the trial Court rejected the remand of the petitioner.

14. At this juncture, the only defence taken by respondent No.1 is that he was unaware of the extension of the interim protection granted by this Court. In this regard, it is imperative to note that, when the learned counsel for the petitioner informed respondent No.1 about the order passed

by this Court, it was incumbent upon the Investigating Officer to verify the said order either from the learned Public Prosecutor or from the official website of this Court. Without undertaking such verification, respondent No.1 proceeded to arrest the petitioner and produce him before the trial Court, which amounts to disobedience of the order passed by this Court.

15. That apart, it is pertinent to note that respondent No.1 was admittedly aware of the initial order passed by this Court on 21.04.2026 granting protection from arrest to the petitioner. Therefore, it was incumbent upon him to ascertain whether the said protection had been extended and to verify the status of the anticipatory bail petition filed by the accused. Without verifying these aspects, respondent No.1 proceeded to arrest the petitioner and produce him before the trial Court. In such circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that respondent No.1 cannot now contend that he was unaware of the subsequent orders passed by this Court. When respondent No.1 physically appeared before this Court, his explanation was that he was not aware of the order and there was pressure in the said

case to arrest the petitioner which fortifies the contention of the petitioner herein. Accordingly, the explanation offered by respondent No.1 cannot be accepted.

16. Further, it is noticed that respondent No.2 was neither the Investigating Officer nor was any direction issued by this Court against him, and respondent No.2 did not arrest the petitioner. Therefore, respondent No.2 cannot be said to be in any manner connected with the alleged act of contempt.

17. As regards respondent No.1, though he has tendered an unconditional apology contending that he was unaware of the orders passed by this Court, the said apology cannot be accepted. The explanation offered by respondent No.1 for his alleged lack of knowledge of the orders passed by this Court is not satisfactory, particularly when he was admittedly aware of the initial order granting protection to the petitioner and failed to verify the subsequent status of the proceedings or the orders passed by this Court, including from the official website.

18. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Contempt Case is partly allowed. This Court holds that respondent No.1 has willfully disobeyed the orders passed by this Court and is, therefore, liable to be punished for contempt.

19. Accordingly, respondent No.1 is sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of one (1) month and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/-, within a period of four (4) weeks from today.

20. Insofar as respondent No.2 is concerned, the Contempt Case stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date:18.09.2026
PT

On Bench

After pronouncing the order, learned Public Prosecutor requested the Court to suspend the operation of the

Sentence for a period of four weeks to enable the State to file an appeal before the higher Court.

Considering the same, the operation of the above sentence is suspended, till 19.10.2026.

K. SUJANA, J

Date:18.09.2026
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CONTEMPT CASE No.2485 of 2026

Date: 18.09.2026

PT