

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE E. V. VENUGOPAL

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7632 of 2026

DATE: 21.05.2026

BETWEEN:

Bablu @ Prashanth and 2 others.

Petitioners/Accused Nos.1, 2 and 4

And

The State of Telangana
Through SHO Bejjur P.S.,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of
Telangana, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.

...Respondent/complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioners/Accused Nos.1, 2 and 4 on bail in connection with Crime No.101 of 2025 on the file of Bejjur Police Station, Kumrambheem Asifabad District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 319 (2), 143(3) read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 19.09.2025, the *de facto* complainant lodged a complaint alleging that her younger daughter, Porsheti Saroja, aged 24 years, and her friend, Korithe Bhudevi, aged 26 years, were working at Venkateshwara Shopping Mall, Mancherial, and residing in a rented room at Gopalwada Colony, Mancherial. On 29.06.2025, both Saroja and Bhudevi came to their village for the Akadi Festival and, on 30.06.2025, left for Mancherial, informing that they were returning for work. The *de facto* complainant's daughter left her mobile phone at home. Later, the *de facto* complainant came to know through her cousin's daughter, namely Shidam Shailaja, that Saroja had called her stating that they were working in Jayashankar Bhupalpally District and again, on 17.07.2025, informed that they were in Chandrapur, Maharashtra State. On 18.07.2025, at about 10:00 hours, when Shailaja tried to contact Saroja over the phone, the phone was found switched off. Since then, the whereabouts of both Saroja and Bhudevi have remained unknown. Hence, the complainant requested the police to trace the missing women and return them over to her.

3. Heard Sri Ramulu Pasupula, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Arun Kumar Doddla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent – State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners/Accused Nos.1, 2 and 4 are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the case. He highlights that the alleged offence occurred between 30.06.2025 and 18.07.2025, whereas the compliant was lodged on 19.09.2025 i.e., two months after the offence allegedly took place. It is stated that the petitioners were arrested on 20.03.2026 and remanded to judicial custody. He further points out that in the interregnum no complaints have been filed by the victims against the petitioners regarding the retention of their phones, contrary to the recovery alleged by the prosecution. This would clearly reveal that the petitioners have not committed any crime. Furthermore, as the entire case rests on the alleged confessional statements, which are subject to proof and cannot be relied upon at this stage, he prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the grant bail to the petitioners and submits that the allegations made against the petitioners are grave in nature. He states that while the F.I.R was initially registered as a 'Woman Missing' case, sections 318(4), 319(2), 143(3) read with section 3(5) of the BNS were added following the confessional statements of the petitioners. He further contends that the petitioners have abducted and trafficked the victims, namely Saroja and Bhudevi, and forcibly conducted their marriages against their wishes at distant places for monetary gain. It is stated that one of the victims, Saroja, has been found to be pregnant, while the other, Bhudevi, has undergone a terminated pregnancy. It is further stated that the investigation is complete and charge sheet has been filed before the concerned trial Court.

6. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners and the Additional Public Prosecutor, and upon perusal of the material placed on record, it is observed that the petitioners have been languishing in judicial custody since 20.03.2026. Furthermore, the investigation is complete

and charge sheet has already been filed before the trial Court. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioners/Accused Nos.1, 2 and 4, subject to 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 learned Principal Sessions Judge at Asifabad.
- ii. The petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly contact, threaten, induce or influence the *de facto* complainant or any of the prosecution witnesses.
- iii. The petitioners shall deposit their passports, if any, before the learned trial Court and they shall not leave the jurisdiction limits of the learned trial Court without prior permission.
- iv. The petitioners shall appear before the Court concerned personally on each date of hearing till conclusion of trial.

- v. The petitioners shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C.(presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).
 - vi. In case the petitioners violate any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.
- 7.** Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.
- Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

E.V. VENUGOPAL, J

Date: 21.05.2026

va/gv