

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7078 OF 2026

DATE : 06.05.2026

Between :

Manne Krishank & seven others

... Petitioners/A.1 to A.8

And

The State of Telangana

... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to enlarge the petitioners on bail who are arrayed as accused Nos.1 to 8 in FIR No.576 of 2026 of Kukatpally Police Station, Cyberabad District. The offences alleged against the petitioners are under Section 333, 118(1), 308(5), 191(2), 351(2), 189 r/w.190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS').

2. The facts of the case are that on 23.04.2026 at about 12:45 hours, at H.No.5-6-129 and 5-6-130, Duyarguda, Kukatpally, the complainant, Sri Gundamalla Rajendra Kumar, working as a Social Media Coordinator (TPCC) was present in his house, the 1st petitioner Manne Krishank, stated to be a Social Media Coordinator of the BRS Party, along with more than ten persons, allegedly trespassed into his residence, attacked him with fist blows, questioning him for sharing adverse content about them on Facebook, and also threatened him with dire consequences. During the incident, when the complainant attempted to record their actions on his mobile phone, the accused persons allegedly snatched the phone, threw it on the ground causing damage, and took it away while leaving the scene upon the arrival of local persons, continuing to threaten that they would kill him. As a result of the attack, the complainant sustained injuries. Based on his complaint, the present crime is registered against the accused.

3. Heard Sri T.V.Ramana Rao, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that the de facto complainant, a Congress Party leader claiming to be the TPCC Social Media Coordinator of Kukatpally Constituency, had posted and circulated a fabricated news article on his Facebook account on 22.04.2026, using the photograph of the 1st petitioner and his wife, falsely portraying it as a genuine report published in 'Andhra Prabha' newspaper, which was subsequently denied by the said newspaper, thereby establishing that the content was fake and intended to mislead the public; based on this, the 1st petitioner lodged a complaint before the SHO, Kukatpally, on 23.04.2026 at 10:00 AM, but no FIR was registered, allegedly due to political influence, and as a counterblast, the de facto complainant lodged the present complaint on the same day at 14:00 hours with false allegations of trespass, assault, and extortion, leading to registration of the present crime, while a subsequent FIR No.577 of 2026 was registered on the petitioner's complaint; it is further contended that when the 1st petitioner approached the police station in the evening regarding non-registration of appropriate offences, particularly under the Information Technology Act, the police, under political pressure, arrested the petitioners and produced them before the Magistrate, who declined remand under Section

308(5) of BNS but nevertheless remanded them to judicial custody citing involvement of A.1 in other cases; it is argued that since the major offence was not accepted and the remaining offences are punishable below seven years, the police ought to have followed the procedure under Section 35(3) of BNSS in the light of Apex Court judgment, but failed to do so; the petitioners have been in custody since 23.04.2026, there is no mens rea to attract the alleged offences, and they have been falsely implicated due to political rivalry; it is also submitted that the investigation is almost complete as several witnesses have been examined. He further contended that the petitioners shall abide by any conditions imposed by this Court. Hence, prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioners.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor filed counter opposing bail contending that during the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer examined the complainant, recorded his statement, and referred him to the hospital for medical examination and treatment, which confirmed that he sustained injuries; further, CCTV footage collected from the vicinity shows that the accused persons arrived at the scene in two vehicles at the relevant time and left

shortly after the incident, and statements of LW-2 and LW-3 were also recorded. It is submitted that there are ten accused in total, of whom A-1 to A-8 were arrested on 23.04.2026 and remanded to judicial custody. The investigation so far reveals that A-1, upon seeing a Facebook post alleging misconduct, developed a grudge against the complainant and, with an intention to retaliate, gathered A-2 to A-10 on 23.04.2026 at about 09:30 hours near Picket, Secunderabad, informed them about the post, and instigated them to accompany him; in furtherance of their common intention, all the accused travelled in two cars to Kukatpally, trespassed into the complainant's house at about 12:45 hours, and assaulted him with hands and fist blows while questioning him about the post, and when he attempted to record the incident on his mobile phone, A-1 snatched and smashed it, and all the accused threatened to kill him. It is further submitted that A-1 is a habitual offender involved in as many as 21 cases, and it was at his instigation that the other accused participated in the offence; therefore, if the petitioners (A-1 to A-8) are granted bail, there is a likelihood that they may commit similar offences and again threaten or attack the complainant. Hence, petitioners are not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, as well as the material placed on record, the petitioners herein are in jail from 23.04.2026 and the alleged offences are under Sections 333, 118(1), 308(5), 191(2), 351(2), 189 r/w.190 of BNS. The trial Court refused to take remand of the petitioners for the offence under Section 308(5) of BNS and the remaining offences are punishable with below seven years. Further, Lws.1 to 13 are already examined including examination of investigating officer. Considering the allegations against the petitioners, the period of their incarceration in jail and the progress in investigation, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners 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 XII-Additional Metropolitan Magistrate at Kukapally.
- ii. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Monday 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 petitioners shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :06.05.2026
Rds

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7078 OF 2026

DATE :06.05.2026

Rds