

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.3959 & 3961 of 2026

DATE: 06.04.2026

Crl.P.No.3959 of 2026

BETWEEN:

Cipiri Manoj Kumar Yadav and another

.....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

Crl.P.No.3961 of 2026

BETWEEN:

Amroj Srikanth

.....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

COMMON ORDER

These Criminal Petitions are filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, who is arrayed as accused in Crime No.2515 of 2025 before the Madhapur Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 127(2), 308(2), 115(2), 351(2) read with 3(5) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 22.12.2025 at about 10:00 p.m., the complainant along with others went to the house of one Narayana Reddy near Rameshwaram Café to discuss an issue relating to a land transaction. It is alleged that Narayana Reddy and his associates forcibly took them into the parking area, snatched cash boxes from them, and thereafter dragged them into a lift where they were assaulted and wrongfully confined. Subsequently, they were taken to a basement storeroom, again assaulted, and confined. It is further alleged that the accused forcibly took away the money brought by them and pushed them out without returning the same. Based on the said allegations, a case was registered for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri T.S. Anirudh Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners as well as Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State and Sri B. Raveendra Babu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case and that the names of the petitioners do not find place in the FIR and they are sought to be implicated only on the basis of vague allegations as “others.” He further submitted that the dispute between the parties is essentially civil in nature arising out of land disputes, and the present complaint has been lodged with mala fide intention. He contended that there is an unexplained delay of seven days in registering the FIR, which casts doubt on the prosecution case and that all the alleged offences are punishable with imprisonment below seven years. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner by allowing these Criminal Petitions.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for respondent No.2, respectively, opposed the petitions contending that the allegations in the complaint clearly disclose commission of serious offences including wrongful confinement, extortion, and assault. He further submitted that during the course of investigation, the petitioners were identified as assailants in the status report filed before the Court and their role is being investigated. Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss these criminal petitions.

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 allegations arise out of an incident involving assault, wrongful confinement, and forcible taking of money in connection with a land dispute between the parties. The main allegation against the petitioners is that they, along with other accused, participated in the alleged assault and wrongful confinement of the complainant and his associates and forcibly took away cash brought by them. As seen from the record, their names do not find place in the FIR and their

involvement is sought to be established during the course of investigation. Further, the material part of the investigation appears to be completed and the offences alleged are punishable with imprisonment below seven years. Considering the same, this Court is inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Madhapur Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release them on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/-, each with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioners 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 petitioners shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on

every Wednesday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., for a period of eight (8) weeks or till the filing of the charge sheet, whichever is earlier and thereafter, as and when required.

- iv. The petitioners are directed not to contact the de facto complainant or any other witnesses during the course of investigation.

7. Accordingly, these Criminal Petitions are allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 06.04.2026
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.3959 & 3961 of 2026

Date: 06.04.2026

SAI