



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

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.7239 of 2026)**

Chittibarika Chandra Shekar & Ors. ...Appellants

Versus

The State of Telangana & Anr. ...Respondents

ORDER

Leave granted.

2. The allegation levelled against the six accused, who are the appellants herein are under Section 306 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC). It is alleged that the 1st appellant was in love with the deceased and though they were not married, they were living together. On the refusal of the first appellant to marry his lover, she committed suicide is the case projected by the siblings of the deceased.

3. The FIR is produced at Annexure P1, registered on the First Information Statement (FIS) of the sister of the deceased. It is the case of the 1st informant that she had called up the friend of the deceased a few days back since her sister was not picking up her telephone. She was informed that her sister had been living with the 1st appellant in his house. The elder sister of the 1st informant then went to the house of the 1st appellant and brought the deceased back to their house. It is admitted that there was a consensual relationship and they were living together for three months in the house of the 1st appellant. It is also admitted that their relationship was accepted by the family of the 1st appellant. In that circumstance it is difficult to comprehend as to why the 1st informant and her sister took the deceased away from the 1st appellant's house.

4. Be that as it may, the FIS continues with a narration that on the next day morning the deceased went out to work and in the evening the 1st appellant called the 1st informant asking her where to drop her younger sister. She asked the 1st appellant to bring her back to their house, but the deceased did not return. Later it is alleged that her sister called up the

eldest sister and told her that the first appellant had refused to marry him and hence she is ending her life.

5. The 2nd appellant is the father and the 6th appellant is the mother of the 1st appellant, the 3rd appellant is the sister of the 1st appellant and the 5th appellant is the person who is the proposed bridegroom of the 3rd appellant and the 4th appellant is a friend of the 1st appellant. The allegation is that the 4th respondent spoke ill of the deceased to the 1st appellant, which made him withdraw from the marriage proposal. The 3rd appellant also implored the 1st appellant from continuing the relationship; especially since the 5th appellant had refused to marry her, if the 1st appellant entered into a marriage with the deceased. The 2nd and 6th appellants, who are the parents of the 1st appellant, also concurred with this view. This is the long and short of the instigation to drive the deceased to death by suicide.

6. That the death was by suicide is unequivocally proved. It also happened in the house of the 1st appellant. That the 1st appellant had a consensual relationship with the deceased for the last few months, is also admitted by the first informant. In that circumstance, it is not clear as to why the first informant took away the deceased from the house of the

1st appellant. When a phone call came to the eldest sister from the deceased, she did not do anything to avert the suicide threatened. We are unable to find any instigation by the accused/appellants to drive the deceased to death by suicide. It was neither intended nor can it be said to be abetment. At the worst, even if we fully believe what has been stated by the 1st informant, there was a refusal of marriage, which led to the woman committing suicide. People react differently to situations and if a breakup ends up with suicide, it cannot always be termed an abetment to suicide. The refusal to marry was not with an intention to drive the woman to death by suicide nor can knowledge be attributed to the accused that on such refusal, she would commit suicide.

7. We are unable to sustain the prosecution initiated against the accused on such frivolous allegations and we quash the proceedings in Sessions Case No.101 of 2024 pending before the Learned IInd Additional Senior Civil Judge-cum-Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Medchal-Malkajgiri District at Kushaiguda, Telangana.

8. The accused/appellants, if in custody, shall be released forthwith, if not required in any other case. If they

are already on bail, then their bail bonds shall stand cancelled.

9. The appeal stands disposed of.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand rejected.

..... J.
(J. B. PARDIWALA)

..... J.
(K. VINOD CHANDRAN)

**NEW DELHI;
OCTOBER 05, 2026.**

ITEM NO.43

COURT NO.6

SECTION II

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

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 7239/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 20-02-2026 in CRLRC No. 763/2025 passed by the High Court for The State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

CHITTIBARIKA CHANDRA SHEKAR & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF TELANGANA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 122543/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 122542/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 122540/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 05-10-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :Ms. Aparna Bhat, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Yash S. Vijay- 3775, AOR
Mr. Shikhar Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Joshua Tom Thomas, Adv.
Mr. Saransh Khandelwal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Ms. Devina Sehgal- 2691, AOR
Mr. Yatharth Kansal, Adv.
Mr. Srikanth Varma Mudunuru, Adv.

Mr. Syed Ahmed Saud, Adv.
Mr. Mohd. Parvez Dabas, Adv.
Mr. Mir Mukarram Ali, Adv.
Mr. Daanish Ahmed Syed, Adv.
Mr. Uzmi Jameel Husain, Adv.
Mr. Mohd Shahib, Adv.
M/s Shakil Ahmad Syed- 3088, AOR

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

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.
3. The relevant part of the order is as under:-

"7. We are unable to sustain the prosecution initiated against the accused on such frivolous allegations and we quash the proceedings in Sessions Case No.101 of 2024 pending before the Learned IInd Additional Senior Civil Judge-cum-Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Medchal-Malkajgiri District at Kushaiguda, Telangana.

8. The accused/appellants, if in custody, shall be released forthwith, if not required in any other case. If they are already on bail, then their bail bonds shall stand cancelled."

4. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(CHANDRESH)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(Signed order is placed on the file)

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)