

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. OF 2025
(@ SLP(CRL.) No.9145/2021)

GATTU KISHAN RAO

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF TELANGANA & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The short question for consideration before us, is as to whether the High Court was correct in passing the impugned order, on the sole premise that the investigation regarding the concerned occurrence has been completed, and the chargesheet had been filed. Therefore, the High Court, vide the impugned order, held that no case was made out for fresh or further investigation.
3. The appellant is the father and father-in-law of the two advocates, being husband and wife. It is the case of the appellant, that they were legally pursuing a matter to expose certain persons, and that due to this prior enmity against them, the offence alleged has been committed.
4. It is also the case of the appellant, that the investigation has not been conducted properly notwithstanding the availability of a video pertaining to

the occurrence.

5. Under those circumstances, we asked the State to verify the video, regarding its genuineness and authenticity. An affidavit has been filed stating the following:-

"11. It is submitted that the video footage submitted by the Learned Senior Counsel of the Petitioner in the captioned matter was sent to TGFSL on 05.08.2025. The TGFSL Report has been received on 11.08.2025 which has stated that the video furnished by the Petitioner is authentic and has not been manipulated.

12. It is respectfully submitted that the above stated analysis of the contents of the video footage i.e. the same revealing the names of Kunta Srinivas and Putta Madhu is made on the basis of a bare hearing of the audio clip. However, for abundant caution and to ascertain the true and correct contents of the video, especially the names taken, the video footage will be sent for forensic examination once again to TGFSL. Conclusion of the result of the same requires at least one month's time. We undertake to furnish the FSL report with an Affidavit regarding the same as soon as it is made available."

6. From the above, we are of the view that certainly the matter requires due investigation, either further

investigation or fresh investigation, which is something the investigating agency is at liberty to do so. We also make it clear that we are not expressing anything on merits. As the State Government has already completed the investigation, and notwithstanding the same, the aforesaid statement has been made, we are inclined to ask the Central Bureau of Investigation (in short, 'the CBI') to take up the investigation and file the final report.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case. we are inclined to give protection to the respondent(s)/accused from being re-arrested. We make it clear that our order will not stand in the way of the CBI from arresting any proposed accused.
8. The appeal is disposed of in above terms.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
[M.M. SUNDRESH]

.....J.
[NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH]

NEW DELHI;
12th AUGUST, 2025

ITEM NO.24

COURT NO.5

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(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 9145/2021

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 04-06-2021 in WP No. 5356/2021 passed by the High Court for The State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

GATTU KISHAN RAO

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF TELANGANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 113170/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 106335/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 12-08-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) Dr. Menaka Guruswamy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. D. Bharat Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Tadimalla Bhaskar Gowtham, Adv.
Mr. Shravan Kumar Yammanur, Adv.
Mr. Aman Shukla, Adv.
Mr. M. Chandrakanth Reddy, Adv.
Mr. Gopal Jha, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Kumar Vaibhaw, Adv.
Ms. Devina Sehgal, AOR
Mr. Yatharth Kansal, Adv.

Mr. Vikramjeet Banerjee, A.S.G.
Mr. Nachiketa Joshi, Sr. Adv. (not present)
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Mr. Prashant Rawat, Adv.
Mr. Ayush Anand, Adv.
Mr. Madhav Sinhal, Adv.
Mr. Yashraj Singh Bundela, Adv.
Mr. Vatsal Joshi, Adv.

Mr. A. Niranjana Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Basa Mithun Shashank, Adv.

Mr. Uday Bhanu, Adv.
Mr. Vikas Mehta, AOR

Mr. S. Nagamuthu, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nishanth Patil, AOR
Mr. Mv Mukunda, Adv.
Mr. Shreyas, Adv.

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

Leave granted.

The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

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

(SWETA BALODI)

ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)