

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.860 of 2026

DATE: 18.02.2026

Between:

Sri Ravula Prashanth

...Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana
Through PS Langer House, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana and another.

...Respondents

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed before this Court for grant of bail to the Petitioner who is arrayed as accused in FIR No.254 of 2025 of Langer House Police Station, Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 78, 79 and 356 (3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (for short 'BNS').

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 03.12.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report before the police stating that the de-facto complainant received multiple harassment calls from the unknown person. The caller informed the de-facto complainant that obscene and sexually defamatory writings containing her mobile numbers were written at Pillar No.68, Lungar House. The caller attempted to speak in vulgar manner. They also sent photos of the written messages to the mobile of the de-facto complainant. It is further stated that the parents of the de-facto complainant went into panic after learning about de-facto complainant. Hence, the complainant requested to take necessary action. Based on the said complaint, the police registered a case against the petitioner for the aforementioned offences.

3. Heard Ms. B. Shirisha, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Ms. M. Aruna Kumari, appearing as party-in-person (i.e., respondent No.2) as well as Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was initially arrested on 08.12.2025, since then he is

in jail and several cases filed against the petitioner. Total eight cases were filed by the same complainant against the petitioner to harass him and all these offences are punishable below seven years and entire investigation is already completed. In such circumstances, no custodial interrogation is required. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the Investigating Officer. 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 submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the allegations against the petitioner herein are heneous in nature and there are several cases pending against the petitioner in various police station with the similar allegations and due to the harassment of the petitioner, de-facto complainant and the parents of the de-facto complainant are suffering. If the petitioner is released on bail, he will repeat the same, as such, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. De-facto complainant filed implead petition to implead herself in the present Criminal Petition. De-facto complainant opposed the bail petition stating that the de-facto complainant

was victimized in the hands of the petitioner and due to the properties purchased by the de-facto complainant in Ameenpur, the petitioner herein is threatening and also making defamatory comments against the de-facto complainant. It is further contended that the petitioner herein is harassing the parents of the de-facto complainant, due to such harassment, the father of the de-facto complainant fell ill and he is surviving with the support of oxygen concentration. Earlier also several writ petitions are filed and de-facto complainant impleaded by opposing the same. The series of all the cases itself goes to show that the conduct of the petitioner harassing the de-facto complainant is improper, as such the petitioner herein is not entitled for the bail and requested the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

7. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, de-facto complainant and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court is of the considered view that, the petitioner herein is in jail from 08.12.2025. Earlier, the petitioner herein filed two bail petitions before the trial Court and the same were dismissed on the ground that the investigation is not yet completed. The record further shows

that the alleged offences are below seven years. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, 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 VI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Nampally.
- ii. The petitioner/accused shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Wednesday 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).

- iv. During the bail period, the petitioner/accused shall not contact the de-facto complainant.
- v. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the respondents are at liberty to file petition seeking cancellation of bail.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 18.02.2026
SRK

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.860 of 2026

Date:18.02.2026

SRK