

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4689 of 2026

DATE: 07.04.2026

BETWEEN:

Police Patel Santosh

..... Petitioner/Sole Accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Through Navipet PS,
Rep. by it's Public Prosecutor,
High Court Judicature at Hyderabad.

..... Respondent

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as sole accused in Crime No.237 of 2025 of Navipet Police Station, Nizamabad District. The offences alleged against the petitioner are punishable under Sections 64(2)(m), 74, 351(2) of BNS and Section 3(2)(va) of SC/ST (PoA) Act, 2015.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 04.09.2025, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that she belongs to Scheduled caste and comes from a poor family. She has two minor children, Bindhu Priyasree (13 years) and Sashvik (12 years), and owns 0.20 guntas of land in Aljapur village, which she previously cultivated with her late husband for livelihood. After her husband's death, petitioner began harassing her mentally and physically. He frequently visited her house at night, forcing her to satisfy his sexual desires, took obscene photos and videos without her consent, and threatened to make them public if she resisted. He also followed her, knocked on her doors at night, and assaulted her in the field. On 23.08.2025, petitioner called her, threatening to kill her if she did not comply with his demands, and promising to take care of her and her children if she did. Later that night, at about 11:00 p.m., he came to her house, abused her in filthy language and outraged her modesty. As such, requested the police to take necessary action against them. Basing on the report, the police registered a case against the accused for the abovementioned offences.

3. Heard Sri Rajagiri Santhosh Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner 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 allegations and that the averments made in the complaint are false and that he has been falsely implicated in the present crime. He further submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 25.02.2026 and that the allegations in the complaint do not constitute an offence punishable under Section 64 of BNS, and even the medical evidence does not support the same. He further contended that the material part of the investigation has already been completed, charge sheet has been filed, and the Sessions Case has also been numbered, and therefore, further custodial detention of the petitioner is not required. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the bail, contending that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and heinous in

nature and that even though the charge sheet has been filed, releasing the petitioner at this stage may result in threatening the *de facto* complainant and the witnesses. Hence, he prayed to dismiss this petition.

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 petitioner has been in judicial custody since 25.02.2026 and that the material part of the investigation has been completed and charge sheet has already been filed. *Prima facie*, the averments in the complaint and the remand report do not constitute an offence punishable under Section 64 of BNS. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court deems it fit to grant 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) each, with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class for Trial of Cases under TS Prohibition and Excise Act cum IV Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Nizamabad.

- ii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C.(presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).
- iii. The petitioner shall not contact the complainant or the victim, nor threaten any of the witnesses.
- iv. In the event of any instance where the petitioner attempts to threaten the de facto complainant or any witnesses, the prosecution is at liberty to file a petition for cancellation of bail.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 07.04.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4689 of 2026

Date: 07.04.2026

SS