

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.15981 of 2025

DATE: 16.12.2025

BETWEEN:

Joseph Sandeep Vadegar

.....petitioner/accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana
at Hyderabad and another.

.....Respondent/complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, who is arrayed as accused in Crime No.738 of 2025 before the Sanathnagar

Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Section 69 and 351(2 of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the de-facto complainant, who had been facing marital issues between 2019 and 2023, became acquainted with Pastor Joseph Sandeep in May 2020 through her sister for spiritual guidance. During this period, he allegedly proposed marriage to her, assured that his own divorce was underway, and sought financial assistance for his settlement, receiving Rs.12 lakhs from her and smaller amounts from her acquaintances, of which only Rs.2 lakhs were returned. She further alleged that, on his repeated assurances of marriage, he visited her residence at Erragadda and induced her into a physical relationship from July 2024 to October 2025, including an instance at Hotel Taj Vivanta on 14.08.2024. Though marriage dates were discussed for September 2024 and April 2025 and he initially consented to marry her on 22.10.2025, he allegedly later refused, blocked her on social media, and threatened her.

3. Heard Sri Vadeendra Joshi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of 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 complaint disclosed no specific allegations attracting Sections 69 and 351(2) BNS and that none of the statutory ingredients of these offences were made out and that the parties had known each other for five years, the relationship was consensual, and there was no material suggesting that any promise of marriage was false from the inception. He contended that prolonged consensual intimacy could not amount to deception and that breach of a promise did not constitute a false promise. He further submitted that the complaint lacked any clear act of criminal intimidation, contained only vague statements, and appeared to have been filed after the petitioner began distancing himself. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest 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 stating that the allegations leveled against the petitioner are serious in nature. Further, the investigation was not yet completed. Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and on a perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the allegations primarily arise out of a prolonged relationship between two consenting adults, both of whom were earlier married and subsequently obtained divorce in the years 2023–2024. The record discloses that the petitioner and the de-facto complainant had been acquainted for several years and, as admitted by the de-facto complainant herself, discussions regarding marriage did take place between them. Whether the promise of marriage was false from inception or whether the relationship was consensual throughout are matters that require thorough investigation and cannot be conclusively determined at this stage. The alleged financial transactions, the nature of the relationship,

and the question whether any deception or criminal intimidation is made out are all issues to be established during the course of investigation. However, having regard to the fact that the parties are majors, the relationship was admittedly long-standing and voluntary, custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear to be necessary for the purpose of investigation. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is entitled to the relief of pre-arrest bail, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Sanathnagar Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release him on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioner shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

- iii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., till the filing of the charge sheet and thereafter, as and when required
7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.
- Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 16.12.2025
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.15981 of 2025

Date: 16.12.2025
SAI