

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10018 of 2025

ORDER:

Seeking the Court to enlarge the petitioner who is arrayed as accused No.15 in Crime No.99 of 2025 of Market Police Station, Hyderabad, on bail, the present Criminal Petition is filed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 18.06.2025, the complainant received a phone call from one Radeshm of Sindi Colony, Rasoolpura, offering to sell 1 kg of gold at 5% below the market rate. Believing the offer, the complainant met Radeshm at Sind Bakery, SD Road, Secunderabad, at about 1330 hours, where Radeshm introduced him to another person named Rambabu. They insisted on verifying the cash before handing over the gold. At about 1350 hours, the complainant took Radeshm and Rambabu to his office in Second Bazar and showed them Rs.72,76,200/-. At around 1415 hours, four unknown persons entered the office forcibly, one of them identifying himself as police from SOT Jawahar Nagar by showing an ID card. Rambabu also joined them. The five

accused snatched the entire cash, took away mobile phones, assaulted, and threatened the complainant, then fled in a car and two bikes. The complainant stated he could identify the culprits.

3. Heard Sri Mandala Nagendra Babu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the FIR, lodged on 18.06.2025 based on the complaint of the de-facto complainant, mentioned only one accused by name, i.e., Keshavulu. During investigation, the police arrested several accused, including A1, A2, A4, A5, A6, A7, A9 to A13, and A16 to A22, on 24.06.2025. In the remand report, the name of the petitioner appeared as A15, with only a brief reference on page 15 stating that A5 had arranged A14 and A15, and that A1 had instructed A2, A11, A9, and A15 to form a team and meet a person. It further recorded that A1, A11, and A15 went to the spot separately and that A2, along with A11, A9, and A15, discussed something, after which A2 informed A1 that the discussion had concluded and that A17 was taking A9 to

another place where the cash was located. Apart from these lines, the remand report contained no allegation that the petitioner conspired or colluded with the other accused, nor did it record any confession statement implicating him. The petitioner was remanded along with other accused persons on 24.06.2025, and again on 26.07.2025 through an additional remand report, which also did not specify his role or any act committed by him in furtherance of the offence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the offences as alleged were grave in nature, but even as per the first remand report, the petitioner was not present at the scene of the offence and there was no clarity as to whom he was to meet or for what purpose. Therefore, his implication as A15 was illegal, and the offences mentioned in the FIR did not attract to him. He further contended that the petitioner is a Government Secondary Grade Teacher at UPS Ujjelli had no criminal antecedents and was unaware of any conspiracy. His implication was unwarranted, and his continued detention would jeopardize his employment. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

6. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, stating that the petitioner had also conspired in the said offence and that this Court had earlier dismissed the bail petitions of other accused. He contended that the petitioner was also not entitled to bail and, therefore, prayed that the Court dismiss the criminal petition.

7. In light of the submissions made by both learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the allegation against the petitioner is that, based solely on the confession statement of a co-accused, the petitioner was implicated in this case. Further, at the stage of considering a bail petition, this Court is not inclined to go into the merits of the case. It is noted that the petitioner was arrested on 26.07.2025, and from the record, L.Ws.1 to 13 have already been examined. As the material part of the investigation has been 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) each, with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned XXII Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Secunderabad.

- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) week or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.
- iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C.(presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

8. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 19.08.2025
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10018 of 2025

Date: 19.08.2025

SAI