

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 6238 of 2026

DATE: 01.05.2026

Between:

Guguloth Naresh

.... Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by the Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad
through the Station House Officer,
Chaitanyapuri Police Station, Malkajgiri Distirct.

.... Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner/accused seeking enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No.440 of 2026 of Chaitanyapuri Police Station, Malkajgiri District. The offence alleged against the petitioner is under Section 69 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 28.03.2026, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report stating that she visited Warangal about seven years ago where she got acquainted with the accused and that later developed into love. The *de-facto* complainant has been working in Hyderabad for the past four years and staying in a hostel. Since last year, the accused moved closer to her in the name of love and persistently pursued her with promises of marriage and ultimately he exploited the *de-facto* complainant sexually. Later, when she became pregnant, he gave her pills for abortion. When she questioned him about marriage, he has been postponing the same on one pretext or the other. Subsequently also, he took the *de-facto* complainant to a hotel and had physical relation against her will and that when she raised the topic of marriage, he defamed her character and threatened to kill her parents. She thus requested the police to take necessary action against the accused. Based on the said complaint, the police registered a case in CrI.No.440 of 2006 for the offence punishable under Section 69 of the BNS and took up investigation.

3. Heard Sri Madas Bharath Chandra, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence and that, without there being any *prima facie* evidence against the petitioner, the petitioner was falsely implicated in the case. He further submitted that the de facto complainant and the accused were in a long standing consensual relationship for several years. He also submitted that the investigation is already completed and the petitioner is in judicial custody since 08.04.2026. Therefore, he prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the allegations against the petitioner were severe in nature and that the offence committed by the petitioner was heinous; therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to bail. On the pretext of marriage, the accused had exploited the de-facto complainant sexually. He also submitted that the investigation is in progress and the

petitioner is not entitled for grant of bail and requested to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon a perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 08.04.2026. Also as seen from the record, the relationship between the accused and the de-facto complainant is long standing, spanning nearly 7 years. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including the nature of the allegations alleged against the accused, the stage of investigation, and the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner–accused, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner–accused 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 XIII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar.
- ii. The petitioner–accused shall appear before the SHO concerned at 11:00

a.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) week or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.

- iii. The petitioner-accused shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date: 01.05.2026
Lrkm

K. SUJANA, J