

**THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.9462 of 2025**

**ORAL ORDER:**

Seeking the Court to enlarge the petitioner, who is arrayed as accused in Crime No.21 of 2025 of Cyber Crime Police Station, TSCSB (Telangana Cyber Security Bureau), registered for the offences punishable under Section 67-B of the Information Technology Act, 2008 (for short, "IT Act") and Section 15 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act (for short, 'POCSO Act, 2012'), on bail, the present Criminal Petition is filed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 05.06.2025, the complainant lodged a complaint with the police stating that petitioner was circulating Child Sexual Exploitative Abuse Material (CSEAM) on the web and the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), on behalf of the Government of India, signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the National Centre for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), USA, to receive Cyber Tipline Reports and proactively gather information on CSEAM. These reports contain details regarding the

circulation of CSEAM as reported by various organizations. Accordingly, Cyber Tipline Reports pertaining to Telangana State were sent online to the Telangana Cyber Security Bureau. Preliminary verification of leads such as CAF details, addresses, mobile numbers, email IDs, etc., was conducted by the Bureau. Based on this verification, the Cyber Tipline Report was traced to an address falling under the jurisdiction of the Cyber Crime Police Station Headquarters, Hyderabad. The enquiry report, along with its enclosures, was forwarded to the Cyber Crime Police Station (Headquarters), TGCSB, Hyderabad, for legal action and to conduct a thorough investigation based on the leads provided in the Cyber Tipline Report. The Director of the Telangana Cyber Security Bureau issued a memo directing the registration of 10 FIRs at CCPS, Hyderabad and that the name and address traced through the NCMEC input during the enquiry should be corroborated with other leads and clues, and the individual involved in the creation, circulation, or sharing of CSEAM should be identified and linked to the offence.

3. Basing on the said complaint, the police registered a case against the petitioner *vide* Crime No.21 of 2025, alleging

involvement in the circulation of CSEAM, for the offence punishable under Section 67-B of the IT Act and Section 15 of the POCSO Act

4. Heard Ms. B. Keerthi Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent - State.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences and that a case had already been registered against him *vide* Crime No.66 of 2025 for similar offences punishable under Section 67-B of the Information Technology Act and Section 15 of the POCSO Act, 2012, in which the Investigating Officer had issued a notice under Section 41-A of the Cr.P.C. Subsequently, for the same alleged offence, the present case was registered. He further submitted that there are no specific or fresh allegations against the petitioner and that the petitioner was arrested on 17.06.2025 in Crime No.21 of 2025 and has been in judicial custody for 56 days. Both the offences in question carry a maximum punishment of up to three years of

imprisonment. Therefore, she prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He contended that the case involved continuous cyber tipline incidents, and that each such tipline warranted registration of a separate crime. Accordingly, three separate cases had been registered against the petitioner. He further contended that the allegations against the petitioner were serious in nature and that the investigation is in progress and if the petitioner is released on bail, at this stage, he may tamper with the evidence and may threaten the witnesses. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, it is observed that both the offences are punishable for three years only and that the petitioner is in jail from 17.06.2025. As the material part of the investigation is completed and considering the facts and circumstances of the

case, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only), with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned VI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Nampally, Hyderabad.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 A.M., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) weeks, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.
- iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(3) of BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

---

**K. SUJANA, J**

Date: 11.08.2025  
ss/js

**29**

**THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.9462 of 2025**

**Date: 11.08.2025**

ss/js