

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

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE E.V.VENUGOPAL

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7835 of 2026

Date: 21.05.2026

Between:

Kommerishetty Sridhar

....Petitioner/Accused No.1

And

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

.... Respondent/Complainant

:: ORDER ::

This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail, who is arrayed as accused No.1 in Crime No.365 of 2024 of Gopalapuram Police Station, Hyderabad. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 308(3), 305(a), 75, 127(4) and 318(4) r/w.3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhitha, 2023 and Sections 5 r/w.6

of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 08.11.2024 at 21:00 hours, the mother of the victim lodged a complaint stating that her daughter filed a POCSO case against her divorced husband i.e. against her father in August 2024. During this time, petitioner, under the guise of helping, confined the victim and the complainant in *Sri Radha Lodge* (Room No.104) from 25.08.2024 to 24.10.2024, depriving them of communication, belongings and medical care. Petitioner sexually harassed the complainant, threatened her and obtained her signatures forcibly and created false debt papers, coerced financial transactions, monitored her phone, and attempted to seize her gold. The complainant and victim remained confined for two months, were subjected to harassment and threats, after which she lodged a complaint against the accused.

3. Heard Mr.Lakshmikanth Reddy Desai, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Mr.Arun

Kumar Doddla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has not committed the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated in the present crime. He would further submit that the allegation of the petitioner confining the de-facto complainant and her daughter in a private lodge for a period of two months is a false and baseless allegation. However, the lodge is a public place where staff and other people are always present. If they were really confined, they could have informed the lodge staff, nearby persons or the police at any time, but no such complaint was made during that period. He would further submit that there is no evidence to show that the petitioner illegally confined or threatened the complainant. No CCTV footage, independent witnesses, medical records or other supporting documents have been produced to support the allegations. He would further submit that the petitioner was arrested on 28.03.2026 and since then he is in judicial custody and there are no criminal antecedents. He would further submit that the petitioner is

ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would strongly oppose the bail application and submit that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The investigation reveals that the petitioner, under the guise of helping the victim and her mother, wrongfully confined them in a lodge for nearly two months and subjected them to harassment, threats and intimidation. He would further submit that the statements of the complainant and other witnesses clearly disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence. The investigation is still in progress and hence, he prayed this Court to dismiss the bail application.

6. Having considered the submissions made by both sides and upon perusal of the material available on record, it reveals that the petitioner is in judicial custody since 28.03.2026 and the investigation is still in progress and since the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation and

abide by the conditions imposed by this Court, this Court grants bail to the petitioner/accused No.1 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 Special Judge for the trial of POCSO Act Cases-cum-XII Additional Sessions Judge, at Hyderabad.
- ii. On such release, the petitioner shall appear before Station House Officer concerned on every Monday between 10:00 am to 2:00 pm 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 deposit his passport, if any, before the learned trial Court and he shall not leave the jurisdiction limits of the learned trial Court without prior permission.

- iv. The petitioner shall attend the trial as and when his presence is required before the trial Court.
- v. The petitioner shall not, in any manner, attempt to influence the witnesses during the course of the trial.
- vi. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated under Section 437(3) of the Cr.P.C. (presently Section 480(3) of the BNSS).
- vii. In the event of any breach of the above conditions, the respondent shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of the petitioner's bail.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 21.05.2026
vsl/sa

E.V.VENUGOPAL, J

4

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE E.V.VENUGOPAL

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7835 of 2026

Date: 21.05.2026

vsl/sa