

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.489 of 2026

DATE: 22.01.2026

Between:

Pasunuri Akhil @ Akil

.... Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through Rep. by the Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
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.943 of 2025 of Neredmet Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate. The offence alleged against the petitioner is under Section 69 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 10.12.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report with the police stating two years ago, the petitioner contacted her *via* Instagram, claiming to know her for the past 10 years, and they began chatting. They entered into a relationship, decided to marry, and had physical relations. A few months ago, they planned to start a fitness centre in Hyderabad, prompting her to resign from her job in Bangalore. However, when she asked him to marry her, he refused, admitting he had faked everything for money and could not marry due to caste. One month ago, she started a fitness studio. On 29.11.2025, petitioner visited her room; when she demanded repayment of money, he refused, threatened suicide. She alleged that the petitioner cheated her with false promises of marriage, exploited her physically, and is now threatening to damage her studio, home, and reputation. She seeks recovery of Rs.2,22,000/- and the gifts given to him, or their value. Consequently, the complainant requested the police to take necessary action, and based on her complaint, a case was registered for the alleged offence.

3. Heard Sri Srikar Jonnalagadda, 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 the relationship between the petitioner and the *de-facto* complainant was consensual, and therefore, the offence alleged is not applicable. He further submitted that the averments in the complaint reveal that it was filed for recovery of money rather than for an offence under Section 69 of the BNS. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 20.12.2025, and 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 heinous 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 20.12.2025. As per the remand case diary, prosecution

witnesses LWs.1 to 10, 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 I Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-I Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Medchal – Malkajgiri District.
- 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: 22.01.2026
SS

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 489 OF 2026

DATE: 22.01.2026

SS