

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4810 of 2026

DATE: 09.04.2026

Between:

Aruna Ponduri and others

.... Petitioners/accused Nos.1, 2 and 4

AND

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

.... Respondent

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, 2 and 4 in Crime No.90 of 2023 of Kodad Town Police Station, Suryapet District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 504, r/w 34 of the IPC and Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC ST POA Act.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 20.02.2023, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that, on 21.11.2019, he has taken 520 yards situated at opposite of Government hospital from Ponduri Subba Rao on lease basis to run the hotel for a period of 5 years. He started Sai Sithara family restaurant. Thereafter, in the year of 22.03.2020 lock down announced due to Covid and second time also lock down announced due to which his hotel business was not running. He gave advance Rs.2,00,000/- to Ponduri Subba Rao and also paid rent for a month Rs. 45,000/-. Due to non running of business as per the agreement, he gave the hotel to Shaik Nayeem on sub lease with the permission of owner. Subsequently, sub lease holders run the hotel for a period of 4 months. In the meantime, Ponduri Subba Rao who gave the hotel on lease died. Thereafter, his wife went to sub lease holder and asked him who are you to take the hotel on sub lease and locked the hotel on the night of 27.10.2022. On very next day i.e., on 28.10.2022, they went to her and asked why you locked the hotel. Upon that she along with other accused abused her and her husband by touching her caste name in filthy language and threatened with dire consequences. Hence, she requested

for necessary action. Basing on the said complainant, the police registered a case for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri T.S. Anirudh Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent No.1-State and Sri Ambedkar Dunna, learned counsel representing Sri Ramakotaiah Kandala, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the present crime is of the year 2023 and initially, they filed a quash petition and the trial Court has granted stay of all proceedings and recently the same was dismissed by the trial Court, as such, there is a threat of arrest of petitioners and in fact, the accused No.1 herein is the owner of the said property and accused Nos.2 to 4 are no way connected with the same and accused No.3 is residing in Canada and accused No.4 is a software engineer and without the presence of the petitioners herein, they are falsely implicated in this case and they are ready to cooperate with the investigating authority and the contents of the complaint itself shows that without vacating the premises, they filed a false criminal case. Therefore, he

prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for petitioners stating that the allegations against the petitioners are serious in nature and the investigation is not yet completed and prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 opposed the bail petition on the ground that already quash petition is dismissed by the trial Court, as such, there is a threat to the victim and also he relied upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Kiran Vs. Rajkumar Jivraj Jain and another***¹ and prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and on a perusal of the material available on record, the allegations against the petitioners herein are that there is a delay of four months in lodging the report and from

¹ 2025 SCC Online SC 1886

the year 2023 there is no progress in the investigation except threat to the victim, there is no other objection raised by the learned counsel for the de-facto complainant. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the allegations against the petitioners herein and also the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Kiran Vs. Rajkumar Jivraj Jain and another***, 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, Kodad Town Police Station, Suryapet District, 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 Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., for a period of 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 victim and also not to threaten the victim.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 09.04.2026
TU

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

S

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4810 of 2026

Date: 09.04.2026

TU