

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4163 OF 2026

DATE: 10.04.2026

Between :

Karmanghat Sudhakar Reddy

... Petitioner/A.1

And

The State of Telangana,
Through the SHO, Sanathnagar PS,
Rep. by the Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad and another

... Respondents/
Defacto Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Surakhsha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.1 in Crime No.99 of 2026 of Sanathnagar Police Station, Hyderabad. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections

65(2), 75 and 351(2) of BNS and Section 5(n) read with 6, 7 read with 8, 9(d) read with 10 and 17 of POCSO Act.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the Police on 23.02.2026 stating that her husband is a software employee and that she is a housewife. They were blessed with a daughter on 13 October 2021, who is now 4½ years old. However, for the past six months, the complainant noticed strange behavior in her daughter. The child stated that her father and grandmother, Buchamma, sleep together in the bedroom and “play like a frog.” The daughter also said that in October–November 2025, her father kissed her on the chest and vagina and beat her on the buttocks. Later, on 11 December 2025, while the complainant, her husband, and daughter were sleeping in the bedroom, she observed her husband at midnight wake up and insert his penis into their daughter’s vagina, kiss her, and touch her lips. The complainant immediately pulled her daughter away. Again, on 24 December 2025, the complainant told her husband she was going to the neighbor’s house and left. When she returned unexpectedly, she found her husband anxiously moving into another bedroom. The complainant also reported that her mother-in-law, Buchamma, exposed her private parts to the granddaughter and kissed the child’s private parts. Similarly, in

January 2026, the complainant's daughter told her that her father urinated into her mouth, asked her about the color of the urine, and threatened her. Out of fear, the complainant took her daughter and went to her elder sister's house, as such requested the police to take necessary action. Basing on the said report, the police registered a case against the accused for the aforementioned offences and the petitioner was taken into custody on 02.03.2026.

3. Heard Sri Manoj Kumar Akula, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Sri Shreyas Reddy, learned counsel for the de-facto complainant and Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences and due to property disputes between the parties, the wife lodged a false complaint against the petitioner and that the petitioner had purchased property in the name of the de-facto complainant. Her sister, who is a divorcee, came into regular contact with the de-facto complainant. The said sister, being an ardent follower of a self-proclaimed tantric practitioner ("Baba"), under such influence began collecting funds in the Baba's name for alleged charity. Under the guise of "greater good and charity," the de-facto

complainant's sister started negatively influencing the complainant to transfer the property standing in her name though purchased with the petitioner's hard-earned money into the Baba's charity. Fearing such transfer, the petitioner transferred the rest of his assets (six properties in total) into the minor child's name, with the petitioner's sister as beneficiary. This act enraged the de-facto complainant and her sister. He further submitted that on 23.09.2025, the complainant deserted the matrimonial home after her sister quarreled with the petitioner. Subsequent police interventions (on 04.10.2025, 05.10.2025, and 01.11.2025) revealed no violence, abuse, or cruelty by the petitioner and that the complainant herself admitted that the petitioner had no bad habits and did not inflict harm, and only expressed trivial grievances. Despite this, the complainant repeatedly involved police authorities without cause, reflecting misuse of law to harass the petitioner and on 20.11.2025, the petitioner issued a legal notice requesting her to rejoin the matrimonial home, as such the complainant returned on 05.12.2025 but again deserted on 05.01.2026 without reasonable cause. He further contended that on 23.02.2026, the petitioner lodged a complaint against her conduct, stating that her allegations were false and motivated by property issues. The material part of investigation is complete.

Therefore, prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the bail petition by stating that the petitioner, being the father of the victim, is alleged to have committed a heinous crime. Given the gravity of the offence and the serious nature of the allegations, the petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed the Court to dismiss the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the de-facto complainant also opposed the bail petition, contended that the offences alleged against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may influence or intimidate witnesses, threaten the victim girl, tamper with evidence, and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

7. Considering the submissions made by both the learned counsel and the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 02.03.2026. As seen from the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, LWs. 1 to 14, have already been examined. Though the allegations against the petitioner are heinous and grave in nature, the averments in the petition indicate that there exists a property dispute between

the complainant and the petitioner since September 2025. It is also noted that the complainant had left the house and later rejoined, and on several occasions both parties approached the police. Taking into account the overall facts and circumstances of the case, progress in the investigation and the period of incarceration, this Court is inclined to grant regular 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) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge cum Additional Family Court Judge, Medchal – Malkajgiri District at Kushaiguda.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) weeks 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 483(2) of the BNSS.
- iv. The petitioner shall not contact the complainant or the victim, nor threaten any of the witnesses.
- v. In the event of any instance where the petitioner attempts to threaten the de facto complainant, victim, or any witnesses, the

prosecution is at liberty to file a petition for
cancellation of bail.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand
closed.

Date: 10.04.2026
ss

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4163 OF 2026

Date: 10.04.2026