

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7071 of 2026

DATE: 06.05.2026

Between:

Metikala Sandeep

...Petitioner/accused

AND

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

.... Respondents/Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed before this Court for grant of bail to the Petitioner who is arrayed as accused in FIR No.386 of 2026 of Jagadgirigutta Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Section 69 of the BNS and Section 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST POA (Amendment Act-2015).

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 18.03.2026, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that that she was first married to a man named Morugu Pradeep in 2016, in the presence of elders. She has a daughter from this marriage. She divorced him in 2018 due to marital disputes. For the past five years, she has known a man i.e. the petitioner herein, as they both worked at the same company, they were friends for one year. Subsequently, in September 2022, she traveled to the UK to pursue her Master's degree, returning in October 2024. Upon learning of her return, the petitioner began visiting her home occasionally. A few days later, he deceived her with false promises, claiming he loved her and intended to marry her and forcibly engaged in sexual intercourse with her in January 2025 and had a live in relation for one year. During that period, he deceived her with false promises of marriage and repeatedly forced her into physical intimacy. Consequently, she became pregnant in November 2022; when she informed him of this, he claimed that "circumstances were unfavorable" and, against her wishes, forced her to undergo an abortion at Green Leaf Hospital in Vivekananda Nagar. He also frequently took money from her and salary to meet his own needs, ultimately taking a total of 13 lakhs from her. On 18.02.2026, claiming that his mother was unwell, he traveled to his native village. On 23.02.2026 she learned through a relative that on 22.02.2026 the petitioner had married someone else.

Subsequently, when she tried calling him, he did not respond. Later, after his marriage had taken place, she went to his village and told about their relationship to his wife. On that Angry, he came to her home, picked a quarrel with her, and physically assaulted her. He beaten her with his hands, and said that he had no desire to marry a girl from a "lower caste" and that his family would never accept such a match. Hence, the complainant requested to take necessary action. Basing on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri Ramchander Chakrala, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the said allegations and whatever the relationship between the parties is a consensual relationship and the petitioner herein is falsely implicated in the present case and he is in jail since 29.03.2026. It is further submitted that the de-facto complainant is already a married woman and the entire investigation was already completed. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to him by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the allegations against the petitioner herein are serious and heinous in nature, as such, he is not entitled for bail. However, he informed that notice was served to the victim. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner herein is in jail since 29.03.2026. As seen from the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, LWs 1 to 17 including the investigating authority have already been examined. Further, the material part of the investigation was already completed. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation, the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate 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), with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned III AJCJ-cum-

XIV Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Medchal-Malkajgiri, at Kukatpally.

- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 11:00 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 petitioner 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 applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 06.05.2026
TU

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7071 OF 2026

DATE : 06.05.2026

TU