

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11751 of 2025

ORDER:

Seeking the Court to enlarge the petitioner, who arrayed as Accused No.1 in Crime No.697 of 2025 of Attapur Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, on bail, the present petition is filed.

2 . The brief facts of the case are that, on 26.08.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report stating that his brother had been abducted by accused persons and that his brother had previously lent an amount of Rs.1 crore to accused No.2. Subsequently, Accused Nos.1 to 5 conspired together and abducted the brother of the complainant. They demanded a ransom of Rs.3 crores, threatening to kill him if the amount was not paid. Basing on the said complaint, a case was registered as Crime No.697 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 140(2), 140(3) and 142 read with 3(5) of BNS.

3. Heard Sri P. Vamsheedhar Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as Sri D. Arun Kumar,

learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the brother of the petitioner i.e., LW.2, admittedly owes a sum of money to Accused No.2 and was merely attempting to collect the said amount from LW.2. However, upon LW.2 refusing to make the payment due to Accused No.2, the present complaint was allegedly initiated with fabricated and baseless allegations, solely to evade repayment. He further submitted that, even according to the de-facto complainant, he received phone calls on 21.08.2025 at around 17:00 hours and again on 22.08.2025 at 09:30 hours. Despite this, no report was lodged until 26.08.2025. Moreover, after the report was filed, LW.2 himself appeared at the police station, which clearly indicates that no abduction had taken place. He contended that the petitioner was arrested on 29.08.2025 and has remained in custody since then and a substantial portion of the investigation has already been completed and that Accused No.2 is residing in Saudi Arabia and has also been falsely implicated in the case. Therefore, 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, contending that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature and that it is alleged that a ransom and abducted brother of defacto complainant and on instructions of accused No.2, accused Nos.1, 3 to 5, threatened the brother of the complainant unless the petitioner arrange Rs.3 crores which shows that he abducted for ransom and the investigation is still ongoing, releasing the petitioner on bail at this stage may lead to tampering with evidence or intimidation of witnesses and prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon a perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner is arrayed as Accused No.1 and admittedly accused No.2 had advanced an amount of Rs.1 crore. According to the complaint, the brother of the *de-facto* complainant was liable to repay the said amount to Accused No.2, and the petitioner, i.e., Accused No.1, was entrusted with the task of recovering the said dues from the brother of the *de-facto* complainant. The remand case diary reveals that the *de-facto* complainant received a phone call on 21.08.2025, yet no report was lodged until 26.08.2025. The statement of the victim

further indicates that he had voluntarily travelled to Narayankhed, where LW.2 was confined for four days. During this period, he was provided with food and water but was allegedly abused and threatened on multiple occasions and that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 29.08.2025. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation, and the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate 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 III Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-XXV Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Ranga Reddy District at Rajendranagar.
- 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).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 23.09.2025
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11751 of 2025

Date: 23.09.2025

SS