

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6128 OF 2026

DATE : 01.05.2026

Between :

Lunavath Naresh @ Lonavath Naresh

... Petitioner/Accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Through S.H.O., P.S. Vanasthalipuram,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad & another

... Respondents/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused in FIR No.680 of 2019 of Vanasthalipuram Police station, Rachakonda Commissionerate. The offences alleged against the petitioner are punishable under Sections 366(A), 376(2)(i)(n), 493, 417 of IPC and Sections 5 & 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 12.08.2019, defacto complainant, mother of the victim lodged a report before the

Police stating that 08.08.2019 her daughter left the house without informing anyone and did not return till night. The complainant and her family members searched for her throughout the night. On the next day, i.e., on 09.08.2019, they came to know through known persons that their daughter was present at TKR College Kaman. Immediately, the complainant along with her husband went to TKR College Kaman and brought their daughter back home. On enquiry, the victim girl stated that one Naresh had induced her with false promises of love and marriage and took her in an auto to his sister's house at Meerpet, near TKR College Kaman, where she stayed for the night and he left her at TKR College Kaman and went away. The victim girl also revealed that the said Naresh had earlier taken her in a similar manner on 2 to 3 occasions and he subjected her to sexual assault. Hence, they requested the police to take necessary action. Basing on the said report, police registered a case against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri P. Manoj, 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. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the accused was arrested in execution of a Non-Bailable Warrant on 31.03.2026 and has been in judicial custody for more than 25 days and that the e-Courts online portal had erroneously reflected the case as disposed of in the year 2022, due to which the accused was under a bona fide impression that no proceedings were pending against him. On account of the same, he did not engage any advocate and was unaware of the dates of adjournments, and therefore could not attend the Court and the accused had no intention to evade the proceedings of the trial Court. He further submitted that no prior intimation was served upon the accused by the police before execution of the Non-Bailable Warrant and that there are no specific or direct allegations substantiated against the petitioner and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. Hence, prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail by allowing this petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the bail petition, contending that the case against the petitioner has been pending since the year 2019 and that though the charge sheet has been filed, the investigation is not

yet fully completed. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to for bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the accused was arrested in execution of a Non-Bailable Warrant on 31.03.2026 and has been in judicial custody for more than 25 days. The contention of the petitioner that the e-Courts portal reflected the case as disposed of in the year 2022, due to which he was under a bona fide impression that no proceedings were pending against him. It is also noted that the charge sheet has already been filed and the case is of the year 2019. Taking into account the overall facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, 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 Fast Track Special Judge for Trial and Disposal of Rape & POCSO Act Cases, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar.

- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the trial Court on every date of adjournment without fail, unless exempted by the Court for valid reasons.
- iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 01.05.2026

ss

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6128 of 2026

Date: 01.05.2026

SS