

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16498 of 2025

DATE: 17.12.2025

Between:

Mohammed Shohaid @ Mirza

.... Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through S.H.O., RGI Airport Police Station,
Cyberabad Commissionerate, R.R. District,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor, High Court,
Hyderabad.

.... Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This criminal petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner/accused seeking enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No.983 of 2025 of RGI Airport Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate. The offence alleged against the petitioner is under Sections 69 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 25.10.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report with the police stating that she is aged about 26 years. In May 2025, she went to Charminar for shopping and, while waiting for a bus, the petitioner—who had been observing her approached and told her that it was getting late and offered to drop her home, asking her to sit on his scooty. After traveling some distance, he claimed that the scooty had a problem and asked her to wait. He then went away, returned with a car and a cool drink, and forced her to consume it despite her refusal. After drinking it, she felt dizzy and lost control. The petitioner then took her to an OYO room and forcibly had physical contact with her. Subsequently, after about 15 days, the petitioner again took her to another OYO room and had sexual intercourse with her. At that time, the petitioner promised to marry her, and she agreed and trusted him. However, when she tried to contact him several times later, he blocked her. She eventually came to know that she was six months pregnant and, therefore, requested the police to take necessary action. Based on her complaint, a case was registered for the aforementioned offence.

3. Heard Sri Azeem Mustafa, 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 the petitioner is innocent of the allegations and has been falsely implicated in the case and that the relationship between the petitioner and the *de-facto* complainant was consensual, and therefore, the offence alleged is not applicable to the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 21.11.2025 and that the crucial part of the investigation has already been completed. Hence, 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 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 21.11.2025. As per the remand case diary, prosecution witnesses LWs.1 to 12, including the investigating authority, have already been examined. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the stage of investigation, the relationship between the parties 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 XXV Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Ranga Reddy District at Rajendranagar.
- 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.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 17.12.2025
SS

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 16498 OF 2025

DATE: 17.12.2025