

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4041 of 2026

DATE: 24.03.2026

BETWEEN:

M. Ashok Vardhan and another

.....petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 2

And

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

.....Respondent/complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, who are arrayed as accused Nos.1 and 2 in Crime No.282 of 2026 before the

Raidurgam Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 69, 115(2), 351(2) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the de facto complainant lodged a report before the Police stating that she became acquainted with Muppa Ashok Vardhan in July 2023, and they developed a relationship based on his representation that he was divorced and would marry her. He later arranged for her to stay in a flat purchased in his company's name, making her sign a rental agreement under the pretext of formalities, and continued a physical relationship while avoiding discussions about marriage. Despite repeated assurances, he neither introduced her to his family nor took steps toward marriage, citing various excuses. On 15.02.2026, he claimed he would discuss their marriage with his father but thereafter ceased communication. Subsequently, an associate, Alok Vardhan Singh, allegedly abused and threatened her, including during a meeting at Starbucks, Khajaguda, and warned of eviction from the flat. The complainant alleges that Ashok Vardhan deceived her with a false promise of marriage and exploited her physically

and emotionally. Basing on the above complaint, the Police registered the case for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri Vinod Kumar Deshpande, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri Shivaramakrishna Rajanna, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the relationship between the parties was consensual and that no false promise was made by the petitioners, who are innocent of the alleged accusations. He further contended that the de facto complainant is in the habit of lodging complaints against several persons, and that she had previously filed a complaint against a gym trainer, which was later settled. He further submitted that the allegations in the complaint do not constitute any offence, much less under Section 69 of the BNS, and that both parties are majors; therefore, none of the alleged offences are attracted and that custodial interrogation of the petitioners are not required for further investigation.

Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, stating that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He further submitted that the de facto complainant is an innocent woman who was cheated by the petitioner under the false promise of marriage. He contended that petitioner No.1 exploited the de facto complainant, and relying on his assurances, she continued the relationship for three years, after which he refused to marry her, having emotionally and sexually exploited her. Further, the investigation was not yet completed. Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submitted that the petitioners are not innocent and that petitioner No.1 has had relationships with several women, with past criminal antecedents against him. He contended that the de facto complainant, being an innocent woman, was cheated at the

hands of the petitioner, and that the investigation is at an initial stage. Therefore, the petitioners are not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

7. In the light of the submissions made by both parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the de facto complainant lodged a report before the police on 13.03.2026, narrating the incidents from 2023, stating that both parties were in a live-in relationship for a considerable period prior to the complaint. It is also noted that she had earlier lodged a complaint on 18.02.2026, wherein she informed the police that petitioner No.1 was not answering her calls and that his whereabouts were unknown. During the course of investigation, the police came to know that the petitioner was safe, and that petitioner No.2 had attended the calls and allegedly threatened her. However, there was no mention in the earlier complaint regarding the relationship between petitioner No.1 and the de facto complainant. Further, though they have been in a relationship since 2023, there is no specific averment in the complaint regarding any promise of marriage made by the petitioner. Considering the duration of the live-in relationship

between the parties from 2023, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it fit to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Raidurgam 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.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 24.03.2026
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4041 of 2026

Date: 24.03.2026

SAI