

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17392 of 2025

DATE: 29.12.2025

BETWEEN:

Varkala Purushtoham @ Bunny

.....petitioner/accused No.1

And

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

.....Respondent/complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused in Crime No.1099 of 2025 of Medipally Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate, registered for the offence

punishable under Section 64(1) of BNS, 3(a) read with 4 of POCSO Act, 2012.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the complainant's minor daughter, aged 17 and preparing for NEET, was found pregnant on 03.09.2025 after medical examination. On questioning, she disclosed that she had established physical relations on 19.05.2025 with a relative, Yeruva Sumith Reddy. The matter was reported to the police, and Crime No. 1099 of 2025 was registered under Section 64(1) BNS and POCSO Act. Initially, the FIR named only Yeruva Sumith Reddy, but later the petitioner was arrayed as Accused No.1. He was remanded to judicial custody on 25.11.2025 and his earlier bail petition was dismissed on 12.12.2025.

3. Heard Sri T. Surya Satish, 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 FIR did not mention his name and that the victim's statements were contradictory, first implicating Yeruva

Sumith Reddy and later the petitioner. He further submitted that the police had already filed a charge sheet against Sumith Reddy, and the subsequent implication of the petitioner was based on a concocted story after the FSL report was negative. He contended that the petitioner had no criminal antecedents, had secured employment abroad which he lost due to false implication. Therefore, he 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 bail stating that the allegations leveled against the petitioner are serious and heinous and nature. Further, the investigation was completed and charge sheet was also filed. At this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner does not arise and the petitioner has to face the trial. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner is in jail since 25.11.2025. As seen from the record, the material part of the investigation has been completed, L.Ws.01 to 11 witnesses

have been examined and charge sheet was also filed. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the incarceration period of the petitioner, 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 I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Medchal-Malkajgiri District at Kushaiguda.
- 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: 29.12.2025
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17392 of 2025

Date: 29.12.2025

SAI