

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT
HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 15336 of 2025

DATE: 03.12.2025

Between:

Ratnala Satyanarayana @ Ashok Chowdary
.... Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Telangana,
Hyderabad, T.S. through P.S. Borabanda.
.... Respondent

ORDER

This criminal petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner/Accused seeking his enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No.616 of 2025 of Borabanda Police Station, Hyderabad. The offence alleged against the petitioner is under Section 69 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and Section 3(1)(r)(s) of SCs & STs (POA) Act, 1989.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 04.10.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report with the police stating that the petitioner became acquainted with her in 2018 while she was residing at her house in Aryogya Nagar. Later, she met with an accident, and the petitioner compelled her family to sell 25 yards of land and five (05) tulas of gold, but provided only a small amount of money for her medical treatment. Under the guise of marriage, the petitioner physically exploited her, and she became pregnant twice. On both occasions, the petitioner gave her abortion pills and forced her to terminate the pregnancies. When the complainant asked him to marry her, he refused and cheated her. Consequently, she approached the police seeking necessary action. Based on her complaint, the police registered a case against the petitioner for the aforementioned offences

3. Heard Sri Neelam Bhargava Ram, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that, with regard to the offence under the SCs & STs (POA)

Act, there are no allegations attributed to the petitioner either in the remand report or in the complaint, and hence the same was not incorporated. With respect to Section 69 of the BNS, it is submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence, as the relationship between the petitioner and the *de-facto* complainant was consensual and there was no deception on the part of the petitioner. During the same period, the *de-facto* complainant did not agree to marry him, and therefore, he married another woman in the month of September. He further contended that, only with an intention to harass the petitioner, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report with false allegations after his marriage and that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 14.10.2025 and that the crucial part of the investigation has already been completed. Therefore, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, the 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 the *de-facto* complainant was subjected to abortion twice, and thereafter, the petitioner refused to marry her and the investigation is

still ongoing. Therefore, 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 has been in judicial custody since 14.10.2025. As per the remand case diary, prosecution witnesses LWs.1 to 16, including the investigating authority, have already been examined. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the stage of investigation, and the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner-accused, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner-accused 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 Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nampally.
- ii. The petitioner-accused 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-accused 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 petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date: 03.12.2025
SS

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.15336 OF 2025

DATE: 03.12.2025

SS